



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 2023

No. 20

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Spirit of love, enlarge our horizons. Give to us this day perspectives that go beyond pessimism and negativity. Lord, enable us to lift our eyes to You, our provider, sustainer, and friend. May we refuse to permit today's challenges to make us forget how powerfully you have led us in the past.

Bless our legislative branch today with Your wisdom. Help our Senators to follow the path that leads to the fulfillment of Your purposes. Inspire our lawmakers to focus on the priorities that will cause justice to roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 31, 2023.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WELCH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Constitution charges the Senate with giving advice and, if we choose, providing our consent to the President's judicial appointments.

The President nominates somebody whom he thinks ought to serve on the Federal bench, and then the nominee comes here to the Senate for a job interview. Sometimes these job interviews make news because they go spectacularly well.

When the Judiciary Committee subjected now-Justice Amy Coney Barrett to a battery of questions a little over 2 years ago, she literally dazzled the country with her force of intellect. At one point, hours into a hearing, after being asked multipart questions about the finer points of constitutional law,

now-Justice Barrett was asked to hold up the notepad she had been provided to keep everything straight, and it was completely blank. She hadn't even touched it.

Justice Barrett is an intellectual outlier by any standard, but she is an appropriate stand-in for the judicial nominees whom Republican Senators confirmed from 2017 through 2020. As one left-leaning analysis admitted in 2020, "based solely on objective legal credentials"—"solely on objective legal credentials"—the last administration's average pick for the Federal bench had "a far more impressive résumé than any past president's nominees." They had more circuit court clerkships, more Supreme Court clerkships—objectively, more experience in the Federal judiciary.

Under President Biden, though, with his nominees, well, you might say things have gone somewhat differently.

Last week, our colleague on the Judiciary Committee from Louisiana, Senator KENNEDY, was quizzing a panel of President Biden's nominees, and he decided to try some very simple questions that should have been beyond basic for anybody nominated to serve as a U.S. district judge. He asked one nominee, currently a superior court judge in Spokane County, WA, to simply explain what article V of the Constitution says. That would be the article that explains how the Constitution gets amended. Here was the nominee's response:

Article V is not coming to mind at the moment.

Senator KENNEDY came back with another, even more basic question. He asked:

How about article II?

As high schoolers across America learn each year, article II sets up the Presidency and the executive branch. It establishes the President's powers, including the power to nominate the person for the vacancy in question. But this sitting judge drew another blank.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S153

Article II wasn't coming to mind either—goodness gracious.

Then she flunked yet another question about legal philosophy, and, then again, she flunked still another question about the most controversial Supreme Court case this term.

Apparently, when this particular nominee had been asked to list the top 10 most impactful cases she had litigated in court, she could only come up with 6. At no stage of her professional career has the judge focused on Federal law. At no point had she ever even appeared in Federal court.

So get this. In one of these six most significant cases she took, she lost to a defendant who forewent legal counsel and took the risky step of representing herself. This wasn't some rooky mistake either. The nominee was over a decade out of law school when she lost to an unrepresented party in one of her biggest cases.

Is this the caliber of legal expert with which President Biden is filling the Federal bench—for lifetime appointments? Is the bar for merit and excellence really set this low?

For years, now, Washington Democrats' rhetoric about judicial nominations has often treated actual qualifications as an afterthought. Democrats were not particularly impressed or moved by top-shelf professional excellence or the academic brilliance that the last Republican administration's nominees possessed, literally, in spades. And, apparently, they don't count those qualities as particularly high priorities now that they are the ones doing the nominating.

The American people deserve an impartial judiciary that is full of the finest legal minds our country has to offer. The American people deserve the best and the brightest.

Alas, but sadly, the Biden administration's questionable constitutional judgment is not limited to some of their judicial nominations. In one important constitutional case after another, the Biden administration and his lawyers have come down on the wrong side of the American people's rights and liberties and have gotten slapped down in court as a result.

This last year, for example, in the Bruen case, the Biden administration threw its weight behind unconstitutional New York State restrictions on the Second Amendment that plainly violated citizens' rights to keep and bear arms. President Biden sent one of his top lawyers to help with the oral arguments, but the Democrats got the Constitution backward and lost the case.

In *West Virginia v. EPA*, President Biden went all in trying to defend massive unconstitutional overreach by his own Environmental Protection Agency. His Solicitor General argued the case herself, but the administration lost badly. The plain meaning of our laws and our Constitution actually won out.

In *Carson v. Makin*, President Biden fought to maintain unconstitutional

anti-religious discrimination in school voucher programs. Again, he lost, and the American people and their Constitution won.

Washington Democrats had their blatantly unconstitutional vaccine mandate for the private sector tossed out by the Supreme Court. They had their obviously illegal top-down mask mandate for transportation tossed out by a district judge. Oh, and, by the way, when the judge was nominated, Democrats howled that she was unqualified. But with a Supreme Court clerkship under her belt, she had incomparably more experience in Federal court than the nominee who failed Senator KENNEDY's bar exam.

Over and over, on issue after issue, this Democratic administration sides against the American people, against the Constitution, and against the rule of law.

The American people deserve an administration that respects their rights and liberties, that understands our Constitution, and that chooses both policies and nominees accordingly.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it only took 2 years—2 years—for the President to acknowledge the crisis that has been raging along our southern border almost since the day he took office. Over those 2 years, we have seen record numbers of migrants attempting to cross our southern border. We have seen record numbers of migrants die—attempting the dangerous crossing of our southern border. We have seen the Border Patrol overwhelmed, border cities overwhelmed, and dangerous drugs continue to flood across our border and reach communities around our Nation.

Yet, for months and months, the President did essentially nothing. In fact, he acted as if the crisis didn't even exist. I am glad that, at long last, the President seems to be acknowledging this crisis, even if his recent visit to the border was scripted and controlled.

But it is appalling to think of how much human misery could have been avoided if the President had lived up to his national security obligations and addressed the border disaster many months ago. I suppose it is not a surprise that the President wasn't eager to acknowledge just how bad things were because that might have drawn extra scrutiny to the President's border policies, policies that played a substantial role in creating this crisis in the first place.

From the moment he took office and even before, President Biden made it clear that border security was at the bottom of his priority list. On his very first day in office, President Biden rescinded the declaration of a national emergency at our southern border. He halted construction of the border wall. He revoked a Trump administration order that called for the government to faithfully execute our immigration laws. And his Department of Homeland Security issued guidelines pausing deportations except under certain conditions. And that was all on his first day in office.

Well, needless to say, the effect of all this was to declare to the world that the U.S. borders were effectively open, and we have seen the result: 2 years of soaring illegal immigration. Since President Biden took office, there have been more than 4.5 million attempted illegal border crossings. Now, to put that number in perspective, that is roughly equal to the entire population of South Dakota, plus the entire population of Delaware, Wyoming, Nebraska, and then some.

Last month, 251,487 migrants were apprehended attempting to cross our southern border, the highest monthly number ever recorded. And, of course, these numbers just refer to individuals Customs and Border Protection managed to apprehend. There have been a staggering 1.2 million known “got-aways” since President Biden took office, individuals that the Border Patrol saw but were unable to apprehend.

President Biden has talked about wanting a safe, orderly, and humane immigration system. Well, up until now, he has failed on all fronts. Encouraging illegal immigration as the President's policies have done is the very opposite of compassionate and humane. There is nothing compassionate about policies that encourage people to attempt the dangerous trip across our southern border, to run the risk of exploitation and disease and exposure and death; nor is it compassionate to condemn border cities to dealing with a never-ending flood of illegal immigration and other cross-border illegal activity.

On top of all that, the kind of unchecked illegal immigration we have been seeing is an open invitation—an open invitation—to drug traffickers, human smugglers, and other dangerous individuals.

Our Nation is currently in the midst of a serious fentanyl crisis. In fact, right now, fentanyl overdose is the leading cause of death of U.S. adults between the ages of 18 and 45. And where is all this fentanyl coming from? Well, most of it is being trafficked across our southern border. And I would be very surprised if the chaos at our southern border isn't facilitating that trafficking.

And—let's be clear—drug trafficking across our southern border doesn't just affect border States; it affects communities around our country. I have

talked to sheriffs in South Dakota, almost as far from our southern border as you can get, who are dealing with fentanyl that has been trafficked across the border from Mexico. Last year, Minnehaha County Sheriff Mike Milstead estimated that 90 percent—90 percent—of fentanyl and methamphetamine in our State, the State of South Dakota, comes through Mexico. Again, I would be very surprised if the chaos at our southern border hasn't facilitated that trafficking.

Our country has been shaped by immigrants from around the world, and I am a strong supporter of legal immigration. I have repeatedly introduced legislation to open up opportunities for individuals to come from abroad and to work here in the United States when employers can't secure enough domestic labor. But immigration has to be legal. It has to be legal for security reasons, for humanitarian reasons, and because we have a responsibility to uphold the rule of law.

I am thankful that the President finally seems to be, at least halfheartedly, acknowledging our border crisis and he has recognized his error in rescinding a number of policies that successfully took pressure off the border. Now let's see how he follows through.

There are definitely things Congress can do to strengthen our border security, deter abuse of our asylum system, and provide resources to those serving on the frontlines against trafficking and smuggling. We can also find ways to address some of the economic factors that influence illegal immigration by leveraging legal pathways to allow immigrants to fill jobs that American employers are struggling to fill.

But the fact of the matter is, while there are things Congress can do to help, the President of the United States doesn't need an act of Congress to move forward on securing the border. The President just needs to enforce the law. For the sake of our national security, our overwhelmed border communities, and the individuals tempted to make the dangerous journey across the border, let's hope he does so.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the past few days, we have seen a number of headlines with surprising announcements about the impact the Biden administration's new border policies have had. Reuters, for example, ran a story

last week titled "U.S. arrests of Cuban, Haitian, Nicaraguan and Venezuelan migrants plummet."

Dallas Morning News had a story titled "Biden administration says illegal border crossings already falling under new policies."

The Wall Street Journal ran a story over the weekend with the headline "Migrant Arrests Fell by Roughly Half in January After New Enforcement Measures."

Well, by reading those headlines alone, you might assume that the administration had finally done something it has refused to do over the last 2 years, and that is to take action to address the migration crisis, the humanitarian and public safety crisis that has been occurring at our southern border. You might think that they started using authorities they already had under existing law to enforce those laws at the southern border and deter would-be migrants from making the dangerous journey north. Well, if you made those assumptions, you would be wrong. That is not the case at all.

As we know, the border has been operating at a state of crisis for at least the last 2 years. Last year alone, U.S. Customs and Border Protection encountered 2.4 million migrants, completely shattering previous records. Last month, we broke the record for monthly encounters. The Agency logged more than a quarter of a million—more than 250,000—border crossings in December alone.

Here is the ugly little secret that the Biden administration so far has failed to acknowledge: Vice President KAMALA HARRIS talks about going to Central America, talks about root causes of the migration crisis, and Secretary Blinken talks about root causes, assuming that this is a regional matter affecting Mexico and Central America and that it is primarily people who are coming to the United States strictly for economic reasons or to flee violence. But the fact of the matter is, people are coming from all over the world to our doorstep and seeking asylum.

A couple of weeks ago, we had a bipartisan congressional trip to El Paso, an urban area. We then went to Yuma, AZ, which is a sleepy little agricultural community right there along the border of Arizona and California. The acting Border Patrol chief told us that they had people from 176 countries, speaking 200 languages, seeking asylum, coming to the Yuma port of entry.

You might ask, how in the world is that possible? That doesn't sound like root causes; that sounds like a global network of human struggling that is exploiting our asylum laws to gain entry into the United States.

Well, Senator MARK KELLY from Arizona, who was with us, said: Well, Mexicali, which is a relatively large city in northern Mexico, just across the border from Yuma, has an airport, and presumably people are flying into

Mexicali from disparate places around the world because they know that if they show up at this port of entry in Yuma, they are likely to gain entry into the United States by claiming asylum, and they know that because of the backlog in asylum cases, their case is not likely to be heard for literally years and that if they did ultimately appear in front of an immigration judge, their chances of successfully gaining asylum, according to the legal standard under American law, was about 10 percent. So it doesn't surprise anybody that many of them don't show up for their court hearing but simply hope to evade detection and be able to permanently settle in the United States.

This is what the Border Patrol calls "no consequences" associated with illegal immigration. What they have told me and anybody else who will listen is that if there are no consequences to coming to the United States and exploiting our asylum system or illegally coming to the United States, then people are going to keep coming.

Indeed, that is what we have seen with an absolute lack of deterrence because of nonenforcement and because of the Biden administration border policies. People all over the world are taking advantage of the Biden administration's weak policies. They are crossing our southern border at an alarming rate, imposing huge burdens on the border communities in States like mine, like Texas, that do not have the resources to meet the demands of this crisis.

It wasn't that long ago that Del Rio, TX, a small community of 35,000 people, had 15,000 Haitians arrive in their city and claim asylum. As it turned out, many of those Haitians had been living in South America, having fled Haiti previously, but they had been living more or less peacefully in South America. But because they saw an opportunity to come to the United States and exploit this same asylum system, they showed up in Del Rio, TX—35,000 people—15,000 of them, overwhelming the capacity of that small city to deal with them.

Until recently, the administration saw two options when it came to migrants. Option No. 1 was to use the authority granted under title 42 to expel these individuals to Mexico. Of course, title 42 is a public health title that has been in place because of COVID. Option No. 2 was to parole them. Basically, that means to grant them permission to enter the United States, where they would await immigration court proceedings, which, as I said, because of the backlog, because of the sheer volume, will take years.

Under the administration's so-called new plan, there is now another option for Cubans, Haitians, Nicaraguans, and Venezuelans. So that is four countries. There is a new option for people coming from those four countries. It apparently doesn't apply to the other 172 countries that the Yuma Border Patrol

chief has said that they have encountered. But under the administration's new plan, there is an option for Cubans, Haitians, Nicaraguans, and Venezuelans that will allow them to remain in the United States legally for 2 years and receive work authorization.

What more of a magnet do you need for people to come to the United States than to give them a work permit and to say: You can stay here legally for 2 years while you await your court proceeding. All they have to do is submit information online before crossing the border and wait for the administration to give them the green light.

Well, the Border Patrol, in educating me and others about what is happening at the border, they talk about push factors and they talk about pull factors. The push factors, we all understand. That is poverty, violence, people wanting a better life. We don't begrudge people who want a better life, want a piece of the American dream, but we do—we should—insist they come to the country through legal means, not illegal means, not exploiting vulnerabilities in our asylum system.

But there is no greater pull factor than this idea that there will be no consequences to coming to the United States, that you will successfully make your way into the United States, into the interior, and you will be able to stay. That is the ultimate pull factor, and that is the reason there is zero deterrence under President Biden's open border policies. Apparently he wants to continue that when it comes to people coming from these four countries.

Well, there are several problems with this plan that I alluded to. First of all, it is not a solution to the open border policies that currently exist. It doesn't discourage migrants from making the long, dangerous journey; it just artificially lowers the numbers.

Here is what I mean by that. Before this so-called new policy, if a migrant from one of these four countries was apprehended at the border, they would be encountered by the Border Patrol and either removed under title 42, repatriated, or paroled into the country.

Every month, Customs and Border Protection reports a total number of migrants released into the United States, giving us an understanding of just how big, what the magnitude of this crisis truly is. Last month, for example, more than 130,000 migrants were paroled into the United States. One hundred thirty thousand were given the paperwork to move into the United States.

The administration has taken a lot of heat for the fact that it is engaging in catch-and-release at an unprecedented pace. Basically, what that means is that rather than being detained while your asylum status is determined—and, as I said, the vast majority will not ultimately qualify if they appear in front of an immigration judge—catch-and-release just makes this worse.

Rather than stop the practice and actually detain and remove migrants

without legitimate asylum claims, the Biden administration came up with this new policy to, in effect, cook the books. The 30,000 migrants a month who enter the United States as part of this new program won't even be included in the monthly statistics that have become a huge political albatross for President Biden. If migrants enter the United States on a legal basis, which is exactly what this program provides, they will never be tallied as part of the migration crisis.

They have taken 30,000 people and said: OK, we are going to make your entry into the country legal—so, by definition, it is no longer illegal immigration—by a wave of the magic wand.

In short, this new policy lets the administration roll out the welcome mat for tens of thousands of migrants while making it seem like the numbers have actually gone down, which they have not.

Problem No. 2 is that any progress is all but guaranteed to be temporary.

According to the administration, we have seen a 97-percent drop in the number of illegal crossings for migrants from these four countries, and, as I said, these are just 4 of the 176 countries represented by the folks who show up at the one Yuma Border Patrol crossing currently. So it is just four countries.

It appears, now, that there are thousands of migrants who would have previously arrived at the border who are now waiting for the Biden administration to approve their online application. But what happens after those 30,000 spots are filled? What happens when it takes months rather than weeks for migrants to receive the green light?

I can tell you exactly what will happen. Migrants from these four countries will start coming across the border illegally once again.

Will they be expelled under title 42? Will they be paroled into the interior? Only time will tell. But one thing is for sure. Once the line gets too long, we will be right back where we started, only with an added challenge: There will be a new population of tens or even hundreds of thousands of people living and working in the United States on what is supposed to be a temporary basis. As Ronald Reagan once noted, there is nothing so permanent as a temporary government program.

Third, the new program normalizes migrants coming to the United States based on facts that would not qualify them under our current laws for asylum. The administration's description of urgent humanitarian reasons that would qualify a Haitian migrant for the program, for example, points to gang violence, the aftermath of an earthquake or a cholera breakout that worsened political, economic, and social conditions. Now, we can all agree that these are terrible conditions, but they don't meet the standard for a valid asylum claim.

That leads to perhaps the biggest problem of all: that the administration

circumvented—did an end run—around Congress to implement this policy, which has basically teed up an even bigger headache.

President Biden is following in the footsteps of President Obama by creating a new category of immigrants without consulting with or getting the agreement of Congress. As we saw with President Obama and the deferred action for childhood arrivals, his use of Executive action 10 years ago has now created more problems for this population of young people who came here as children and who are now adults because the courts have so far said that President Obama didn't have the authority to do what he purported to do.

By the way, if you go back and do an internet search and see what President Obama said shortly before he granted this deferred action for childhood arrivals, I think he said, perhaps as many as 17 times—I could be off a little bit—that he did not have the authority. He said he did not have the authority to do what he ultimately did, and, unfortunately, now the courts are agreeing with him, putting the livelihood and future of these young people in jeopardy.

It has been more than a decade since DACA was established, and the fate of these young people is still being litigated in court. It is a terrible circumstance to find themselves in, and this won't be any different.

The Biden policies will allow migrants to live and work in the United States for 2 years, and then what? Well, will they leave voluntarily? I doubt it. Will they be apprehended and removed by Immigration and Customs Enforcement? No, I doubt that. Or will this be another group of migrants who will live in the shadows?

There is no question that our immigration system is broken. I have yet to find a person—a responsible person—who thinks our immigration system is working the way it should. It is big, it is outdated, it is inefficient, and it is not serving our Nation's interests well. But if the President wants to undertake immigration reform, as he says he does, this is not the way to go.

By end-running Congress to try to establish new categories of immigrants, he is poisoning the well. He is making it harder for us to do what many of us would like to do, and that is to take on the monumental task of securing the border and creating a legal immigration system that serves our Nation's interests and one that we can be proud of.

But, by poisoning the well, the President is not gaining new allies. He is just ensuring that more people will resist any potential legislation that we might take up soon. So despite what the initial data may suggest, what the spin doctors here in Washington have been selling to the news media, which has gullibly been accepting that, as if this is somehow a big deal for a negative trend in terms of illegal immigration, it is not so. The President hasn't

solved the problem. He has just swept it under the rug, and he has, arguably, made it worse.

This crisis is complex, but the solution isn't. The administration needs to engage with Congress and enforce our immigration laws that are on the books and those that are being exploited by the international criminal networks that are smuggling people into the United States on a daily basis.

We need to work together to address those gaps that are being exploited. If migrants from any country see that the United States is quickly detaining and removing people who do not have a legal basis to remain in our country, the flow of illegal immigration will drop dramatically. That is the only viable path forward and where the administration should focus its time and effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

BRISTOL BAY

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today to applaud the Biden administration and their historic step to permanently protect Bristol Bay, AK. More than a decade after the Pebble Mine was proposed, the Environmental Protection Agency, today, is finalizing a Clean Water Act protection that will permanently protect Bristol Bay. No company will ever be able to stick a mine on top of some of the best salmon habitat in the world.

Salmon fishermen from Alaska and from my home State of Washington will continue to earn their livelihoods from Bristol Bay salmon, as they have for generations. No Bristol Bay salmon will ever have to swim through toxic soup just to get to its spawning grounds.

This scientific decision today by the Environmental Protection Agency puts a final nail in this mine's proposal.

It is difficult to understand and to really know the importance of Bristol Bay. In an average year, 40 to 60 million sockeye salmon swim into or out of the bay. Last year was a blockbuster run. Nearly 80 million sockeye salmon returned to Bristol Bay.

That is why Bristol Bay is known as the holy grail of salmon. Today, Bristol Bay salmon fisheries are a \$2.2 billion annual industry. They support over 15,000 jobs in the Pacific Northwest and nationwide, and that is through commercial fishing, recreational fishing, tourism, seafood, restaurants, shipbuilding, and other associated industries.

I know the Presiding Officer knows this well because northern California also benefits from these salmon sectors and the salmon industry.

Salmon are one of the most important products that we in the Pacific Northwest have. It is the symbol of our region. So Bristol Bay salmon, being a powerhouse and supporting nearly half of the sockeye salmon harvested

around the globe, is certainly worth fighting for.

So, as you can imagine, when a mining corporation decided to try to build a mine in the headwaters of this most powerful salmon run on the planet, fishermen in my State and in many other States were outraged. Estuaries and mines really don't mix, and they certainly don't belong together at the headwaters of one of the most important salmon runs and spawning grounds in the Nation.

For fishermen, the destruction wrought by Pebble Mine would have swept away their businesses and their way of life, and they certainly raised their voices and came to ask me and others in Washington for help.

In 2011, I was proud to stand with fishermen and Tribes from my State and from Alaska to speak out against Pebble Mine and to call for permanent protections under the Clean Water Act if the science showed that the mine would have irreversible impacts on salmon. Well, sure enough, the science is damning, and that is what is being released as part of this decision today.

In 2020, the Environmental Protection Agency found that more than 185 miles of streams and over 3,800 acres of wetlands would be permanently damaged or destroyed by Pebble Mine due to its toxic waste and habitat destruction, and that is just if the mine operated the way it was supposed to. That wasn't considering the kind of degradation that could happen if an accident happened. Those statistics don't account for a potential mine disaster that could really wipe out this irreplaceable ecosystem.

So despite the clear science, the mining company has continued to claim that protecting Bristol Bay is a partisan government overreach. Their executives believe that stripping all the gold and copper out of Bristol Bay is a worthy goal, more important than our wild salmon or more important than the generations of Washington and Alaska fishermen who earn their livelihood from that.

Protecting our fishing economy should not be a partisan issue, and that is why Congress created a fail-safe Clean Water Act provision called section 404(c). This provision says that if disposal or dredging in a waterway would destroy fisheries, municipal water, or have other serious impacts, the Environmental Agency could step in to stop the project.

It is a simple concept, really: Let's not destroy a profitable, sustainable industry that keeps the water clean for the sake of just temporary extracting.

Still, this authority in 404(c) isn't used lightly. Since 1972, millions of Clean Water Act permits have been approved, compared to only 14 times that this provision has been used to stop major projects like the one today that is being stopped at Pebble Mine.

Republican Presidents have used this Clean Water 404(c) authority 11 times. Let me say that again.

It has only been implemented 14 times in our history, and 11 times it was used by a Republican President. Ronald Reagan alone used the Clean Water Act 404 authority 8 times.

So there was a time when people believed in this conservation. They believed in making sure that we preserve what is so unique about our planet.

To sum it up, a multinational corporation thought that it could go to one of the most iconic salmon runs on the planet and decimate those jobs that we rely on in Bristol Bay and tear a hole in the culture of our Northwest fabric. And fishermen and we here said: No.

I am proud of the scientific work done by the Environmental Protection Agency under President Biden, the University of Washington, and so many of the environmental partners that fought so hard to stop this project.

I am proud to have stood with the fishermen and Tribes of Bristol Bay in saying we need to protect this unique place forever.

I want to thank some of our greatest champions: The United Tribes of Bristol Bay, the Bristol Bay Native Corporation, and the fishing families in Alaska and Washington.

I want to thank my staff, Nikki Teutschel, Amit Ronen, and Jeff Watters, who, through a decade, all continued this fight to make sure that every administration was listening to this cause.

It seemed like a "David and Goliath" many times, this battle, but we know today that the voices of fishermen at Bristol Bay provided the leadership that we needed to preserve this area forever and said no to this project.

Fishermen know that the Pacific Northwest salmon is worth more than copper, and today, salmon is even worth more than gold. It is our Pacific way of life, and thanks to this administration, it will be protected.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Democratic whip.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it took 15 votes for KEVIN MCCARTHY to become Speaker of the House of Representatives. It may not have been historic, but it was a sight to behold. To finally become Speaker, KEVIN MCCARTHY made all kinds of commitments to the MAGA extremists in his Republican Party.

One of the promises he made to the hard-right holdouts in order to become Speaker was that House Republicans

would use their razor-thin majority in the House to try to freeze Federal spending in fiscal year 2024 to fiscal year 2022 levels. Let me bring that down in plain English. This means cutting \$130 billion out of the Federal budget that Congress just passed last month—\$130 billion is nothing to sneeze at.

Now, how are they going to do it? What is on the Republican agenda in terms of cuts? Speaker MCCARTHY won't say and neither will the House Republicans. What they have said is they plan to use the debt ceiling as leverage to try to get their way.

What is the debt ceiling?

Let me give you an example. Last night, you went to a restaurant with your family. You had a wonderful meal, and you paid for it with your credit card. In a couple weeks you are going to get a bill from your credit card company saying now it is time to pay for that wonderful meal. That is our debt ceiling.

If we don't pay those bills on a timely basis, it raises the question as to whether we are credible or reliable, and those people who loan us money, if they worry about whether the United States is going to pay its debts, they are going to demand higher interest rates to protect their purchase of U.S. securities. That is the bottom line.

We have never—underline “never”—defaulted on our national debt and debt ceiling in our history. As a consequence, the United States enjoys a solid reputation for financial stability. Well, Speaker MCCARTHY has decided to put that on the chopping block.

Let's get right up to the eleventh hour and see if we are going to extend the debt ceiling. It is within his power to stop it, and that is his threat. What we have said to him is: If you have something, a plan for cutting spending or raising taxes, which is unlikely—if you have a plan for cutting spending, be honest with us and tell us what it is.

Some of the proposals are incredible. There is an actual proposal to create a Federal—that is national—sales tax of—listen—30 percent. A 30-percent sales tax. So if that loaf of bread cost five bucks at the grocery store—and in Springfield, some of them do—instead of paying \$5, you will pay \$6.50. Did you think prices were already going up for food in the grocery store? Tack on 30 percent and see how it feels.

And the problem with this is not just the notion of a national sales tax of 30 percent; the problem is, who will pay it. Do you think the richest people in the world give a toot about grocery bills? They don't. But folks who are struggling paycheck to paycheck, trying to feed hungry kids, do. They can tell you week to week what is going on in the grocery store, and it is not very encouraging.

So one of the Republican plans for reducing Federal spending is creating a national sales tax of 30 percent. I am not making this up. This is one of the proposals which Speaker MCCARTHY

has agreed to call as part of his response to the debt of the United States. MAGA Republicans are threatening to use the credit worthiness of the United States as a bargaining chip in a political debate here on Capitol Hill. And, I am sorry to say, if they go the direction we expect they will, it will go beyond a national sales tax.

They are talking about cuts in some of the most important entitlement programs in our budget. What are those programs? Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, veterans' benefits. The list goes on. And it gets down into the heart of this economy. It gets down to whether or not the vast majority of retirees in the United States of America will have enough money to get by. Food bills are going up, the gasoline bills have gone up in the past, and this idea that we are going to cut Social Security benefits—the Republicans are on the wrong track.

Refusing to pay America's bills for the first time actually won't cut the national debt. It will end up in increasing interest rates and will increase the debt by \$80 to \$150 billion, and that is just a start. Millions of Americans can lose their jobs, and it can push us into a recession if we default on the debt. Workers with 401(k) plans will see huge losses in their retirement savings, and a new 30-year mortgage on a home will cost an additional \$130,000, on average. Are people going to buy homes? Not likely. But people who own homes will see the values of those homes diminished, all because of this reckless strategy of confrontation by Speaker MCCARTHY.

One-quarter of our entire national debt—that is \$8 trillion worth of debt—was accumulated during the administration of Donald Trump. One-fourth of the entire debt of the United States in its 230 years of existence—one-fourth of it—was accumulated in those 4 years. Of course, there was money spent on the COVID crisis. I understand that. But there was also a \$2 trillion tax cut under President Donald Trump. Who got the tax cut? Most of it went to the wealthiest people in America and the biggest corporations. It is the tried and true Republican approach—cut taxes on the rich and hope for the best.

The last time the United States had a balanced Federal budget, incidentally—was it under a Republican President? No, it was a Democrat, Bill Clinton. The fiscal year 2001 Federal budget had a \$128 billion surplus. Remember what Republicans' fear about the deficit was back then? They told us. The Republicans claimed that paying down the national debt too quickly would hurt the economy. They were critical of us in either direction—either too much debt or not enough.

So instead of using the fiscal year 2001 surplus as a downpayment on the national debt, Republicans—you guessed it—passed a huge tax cut in those days overwhelmingly benefiting rich people and powerful corporations. They said, and they always say this:

Those tax cuts will pay for themselves—the same bogus claims they make about all their big tax cuts for the wealthy. Instead, 7 years later, the last budget George W. Bush sent to Congress contained a \$1.4 trillion deficit.

The same thing happened when Ronald Reagan was President. Republicans passed huge tax cuts for the wealthy and promised that they would pay for themselves. If we could just get the rich a little richer, then working families would be better off. Instead, they produced the biggest budget deficit that America had ever seen.

So do they have a credibility gap on that side of the aisle when it comes to deficits? They sure do.

Rich Lowry, the editor-in-chief of the *National Review*, once the “Bible” of American conservatives, commented on what the MAGA strategy means. In an op-ed last week, he wrote:

It's very strange not to seriously pursue a deeply held goal when you have unified control of Washington, then to insist on trying to achieve much of it in one fell swoop when you barely have control of one chamber in Congress.

But here we are. This is the Republican pattern.

In the last fiscal year, under President Biden and a Democratic majority, we actually reduced the deficit by \$1.4 trillion, the largest 1-year drop in American history under President Biden.

Democrats passed the Inflation Reduction Act to reduce the cost of healthcare, prescription drugs, and energy for American families, and to strengthen our Nation's energy independence with safe, new energy solutions.

The Inflation Reduction Act also cuts the deficit by more than \$300 billion. We are not ignoring the problem. We are trying to address it seriously—the smart way to reduce the deficit: cut where you can, invest where you must, and make sure it is fair for middle-class and lower income families, not a boondoggle for the superrich in America.

President Biden kept his promise to not raise taxes on anyone making under \$400,000. Democrats added a 15-percent minimum tax for wealthy corporations. It just was hard to take that these wealthy corporations and profitable corporations were paying nothing on taxes—that is right, nothing—leaving the middle class to pick up the tab in America.

Compare that to the new MAGA majority in the House. During their first week on the job, House Republicans proposed to increase the budget deficit by \$100 billion by making it easier for wealthy individuals and big corporations to cheat on their taxes.

Think about this: The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities says that the IRS has 2,284 fewer skilled auditors to handle the sophisticated returns of wealthy taxpayers than it did in 1954. Seventy years ago, we had fewer auditors.

I believe the vast majority of Americans does their level best to file an honest tax return and pay their fair share of taxes. It boils my blood and theirs, too, to think that the tax cheaters are getting off the hook because the cops are not on the beat.

Historically, Republicans have taken away those auditors; have taken away the checks of the big, wealthy individuals and corporations. And they, of course, are tempted to cheat. Why let that happen when the vast majority of American families is doing the right thing? House Republicans just voted for a bill that will add \$100 billion to the deficit to take away these auditors. That is not the way to balance a budget, and it is not fair to American taxpayers.

If that is not enough, as part of the deal, Speaker MCCARTHY also promised MAGA hard-liners that the House would vote on that jumbo-sized national sales tax, which I spoke about. As Grover Norquist, who is quite a conservative and quite a man on the issue of taxes, said: It is a political gift to Biden and the Democrats to consider a national sales tax. Well, we say: If this is a gift, no thanks.

In the last 2 years, America's economy broke records and created 11 million jobs—the strongest job creation in the history of this Nation. The Nation's unemployment rate is near a 50-year low. Gas prices are finally coming down. Inflation is just starting to ease, and the deficit is going down. We need to keep the country and economy moving in the right direction, not devastate Social Security and Medicare and certainly not impose a national 30-percent sales tax.

Speaker MCCARTHY is meeting with President Biden tomorrow for the first time since he became Speaker. He needs to show up not just with platitudes but with a plan, in writing, as to what the Republicans want to put on the table.

What is the Republican plan? Are they going to cut Social Security and Medicare? Mr. MCCARTHY said “no, no way,” on a Sunday talk show this weekend, but the math doesn't add up for his fiscal goals unless he goes after the entitlement programs.

If you are going to do that, Speaker MCCARTHY, be honest with the American people. Are the Republicans planning to slash money for education? healthcare? veterans? transportation? clean water? In the first two decades of this century, thanks in large part to the National Institutes of Health, cancer deaths went down by almost one-third in the United States—saving an estimated 3.5 million lives. Are we going to cut medical research, Mr. Speaker?

Speaker MCCARTHY and MAGA Republicans need to level with the American people.

Speaker MCCARTHY, my ask is very simple: Put your plan on the table.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

NATO

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I rise to highlight the need to strengthen our alliances as bad actors around the world continue to threaten peace and global stability.

In August, my Senate colleagues and I took a critical step to bolster our defense by ratifying Finland and Sweden as NATO members. This was the right action to take. It is time for all remaining NATO member countries to follow this example and approve expanding our Transatlantic Alliance by adding two very valuable and reliable partners.

In just a few short weeks, we will be marking a grim milestone of the 1-year anniversary of Russia's unprovoked invasion of Ukraine. Russia's brutal actions in Ukraine, coupled with its increasingly escalatory rhetoric and continued aggression, have shown us and our allies that we must strengthen our collective ability to maintain global stability. Given their proximity to Russia, Finland and Sweden are investing in their capabilities to prevent a similar attack.

The Finns have demonstrated their willingness to enhance NATO's military strength by significantly increasing military spending above NATO's requirements, participating in joint military training exercises, and strengthening its air power with upgrades to an F-35 fleet under the Foreign Military Sales program.

Finland has been one of NATO's most active partners and a strong contributor to NATO-led operations and missions in the Balkans, Afghanistan, and Iraq. The Finns have also delivered crucial support to Ukraine by providing hundreds of millions of dollars in military aid in addition to providing critical humanitarian assistance.

Finland's large, well-trained ground force and increasingly capable air force are interoperable with NATO. The Finns also have extensive experience in monitoring Russian activities along their 833-mile shared border, and its addition would make defending the Baltic States so much easier.

Earlier this month, I visited Finland and met with defense leaders who reaffirmed their commitment to bilateral cooperation and the value they would bring to NATO. As a member of NATO, I have no doubt Finland would be a net contributor of security, not a taker.

I strongly urge remaining members to join the U.S. and approve Finland's and Sweden's accessions to NATO to confront evolving security challenges and the ongoing threat posed by Russia's aggression against Ukraine.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

TRIBUTE TO THE SAINT JAMES ACADEMY TROJANS AND JIMMY PERRY

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, today, I want to begin by recognizing a

former colleague of mine and some of Alabama's student athletes.

The Saint James Academy Trojans in Montgomery, AL, recently won the Class 3A Football State Championship for the first time in the school's history. The team, no doubt, put in many long hours on and off the field to prepare for this great, historic achievement. Winning is always fun, but the lessons learned about dedication, discipline, and perseverance will stay with these young men and coaches forever.

I also want to extend a special congrats to the Trojans' coach, Jimmy Perry, on the State championship and on his recent retirement announcement. What a way to go out.

I first met Coach Perry when I hired him in 1999 to be the director of football operations at Auburn University. It was clear then that he had a very bright future ahead of him in the world of coaching, and it is fitting that his coaching career has ended with this historic victory.

So congratulations to Coach Perry and his team at Saint James Academy. I wish them all the best and the coach all the best in future endeavors.

BIG GOVERNMENT

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, last week, I spent time on the floor urging my colleagues to prioritize freedom in the 118th Congress. By learning from the mistakes of overregulation in the past, we can focus on creating a brighter future and a more prosperous future for all Americans.

We should be doing everything we can to fix the problems created by the government and get Americans back on their feet by unleashing our economic potential and opening doors of opportunity. Unfortunately, too many here in Washington are still focused on growing the size of government and adding regulations they say will save the environment. However, very rarely does making the government larger benefit the American taxpayers and the American citizens of this country.

For decades, fans of Big Government have used climate change warnings to grow their power—for decades, for as long as I can remember. They have claimed we are near the edge of a climate cliff—a prediction they know is impossible to prove and has never come true. Of course, they claim the only solution to this cooked-up crisis is for you, the American taxpayer, to sacrifice even more of your freedoms to tackle this so-called climate dilemma. This sacrifice won't come from the elites, who flew their private jets to Switzerland just a few weeks ago—the ones who are crowing about this. They flew, just a couple of weeks ago, to lecture, while they were there, the working families of this country. No. These sacrifices are expected to be made by average, hard-working American taxpayers. That is what they want.

They want you to give up your affordable gas for imported fuel that is

triple the cost. They want you to give up your ground beef for overpriced and underwhelming meat substitutes. They want you to give up affordable, abundant clean energy we could produce right here in America for the enormous cost of green energy policies. They even want you to be banned from cooking on gas stoves because how you cook in your own kitchen is now the government's business. They want our farmers to cut back and worry about emissions while they are focused on feeding the country and the rest of the world, which is a huge priority. Most importantly, they expect you, the American taxpayer, to foot the bill for their radical climate agenda—obviously.

Well, I think I speak for most Americans when I say: No way. We should say "no way" to overpriced electric cars that are made with cobalt, processed and sold by China, and plugged into a charger that is powered by fossil fuels anyway. How do we come up with electricity? By fossil fuels.

We should say "no" to fake meats—products that taste as bad as their price and that will eventually kill our livestock producers' way of life. What are we trying to do—put our farmers out of business? Exactly. That is what the climate agenda is about, even though, as we all know, our food security is national security, and we should be promoting domestic food production by protecting our Nation's farmers in every possible way we can—in every way.

We should say "no" to unreliable energy sources and the skyrocketing utility bills we are seeing today because America cannot operate and achieve economic success without fossil fuels. It is impossible. I don't know what we are trying to prove. We will come back, but, hopefully, it is not at the sacrifice of the American taxpayers.

We should say "no" to trillions and trillions of taxpayer dollars spent on an agenda that is based only on the rantings of failed candidates like Al Gore and John Kerry, global elites at a ski resort, and a European teenager who needs to go back to school and learn to read and write and learn math and stay out of politics at her age. That agenda is based solely on fearmongering and unproven theories—unproven—but that is how the left likes it. That is how they use fear—to push policy. Their agenda ignores reliable clean energy sources, like nuclear and natural gas that should be viable, but that does not fit their narrative. That is the reason they don't talk about it.

They know nuclear energy—nuclear energy—is the answer, but the climate change group who continues to bark about this, they don't want answers. They don't want to talk about nuclear because the problem itself is too valuable for their pocketbooks and politicians' ambitions. Instead, their narrative has created a growing—growing—group of Americans and people around the world who now genuinely

believe they should live in fear every day. We are teaching it in our schools, we are teaching it in clubs, and it is wrong. These are the folks who throw soup at famous paintings while gluing themselves to the wall and shut down city streets and major highways, calling themselves climate activists.

For standing here on the Senate floor calling this out, some may call me a climate change denier, so I want to be clear. As a conservative, I believe in protecting our environment, conserving our natural resources, and doing what we can to make sure Americans live in a clean, safe environment, in clean communities that will last for generations to come. But I do not believe that we need to give up our livelihoods, our way of life, our access to affordable food and energy because of false claims that we are just a few years away from extinction. These claims are simply not true, and repeating them is dangerous. Instead, I believe we should be investing—investing heavily—in American energy production because we already produce some of the cleanest energy on the face of the Earth.

Giving up our cars, our farms, and our affordable gas prices will do nothing—will do nothing—to stop the changing climate. It has done it for millions of years, and nothing we can do is going to stop that. In fact, in recent years, the United States has only been responsible for about 11 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions—11 percent. In comparison, China, a country with zero plans to cut back, is responsible for 27 percent of global emissions. China's total emissions of greenhouse gases in 2019 were more than our country and every developed country in the world combined.

Our adversaries, like the Chinese, have no plans—they have no plans—to cut back their usage because their economies are growing thanks to affordable energy. In 2020 alone, China invested almost \$475 million in coal projects. That was in addition to the 1,100 coal powerplants they already have in use—almost four times the number we have in the United States. Guess what. They are building 350 as we speak. They are not slowing down. Their emissions level will continue to increase rapidly.

Meanwhile, our country's emissions have fallen by about 17 percent since 2005, thanks—now, think about this—thanks in part to our turn to abundant, cleaner sources, such as natural gas, of which we have a 200-year supply already under the ground in this country as we speak. We couldn't use it in 200 years. But we refuse to dig for it, and we refuse to use it.

Not only can we produce the world's cleanest natural gas, we also have the ability to produce the cleanest nuclear power in all of the world—the cleanest. We have refused to use it. We want to import the dirtiest oil, refine it here in our country, and pollute our country because we are too stubborn to use our own.

That will eventually change. It always goes back around. We will use our energy and in just a short period of time. But the climate extremists running the current administration's energy policies would rather beg foreign countries and make deals with dictators whose countries produce all that dirtier oil. It makes no sense.

Blaming the United States for a global problem we didn't create is unfair to whom? The American taxpayers.

Importantly, the energy that we can and should produce at home is terrible for our own economy—that is what they are saying. It makes no sense.

We have to be able to do two things at once: Help our economy thrive and promote innovation that leads to cleaner energy production. We can do two things at one time, but a cult-like obsession with climate alarmism is making us weaker and poorer in the name of a problem created by politicians.

I am calling for commonsense solutions. Let American companies produce more energy. Recognize the benefits of clean energy, like natural gas and nuclear—that is the answer. Stop scaring people into depression by warning of the great climate extinction. Fear is a terrible thing to use. It is not true.

We should focus on solutions that will actually help our people. Last year, I introduced the Restoring American Energy Independence Act. This bill would have reversed President Biden's shutdown of American energy and returned American energy to full production. Of course, it went nowhere with a Democrat-controlled Senate. It didn't get to first base. I hope to see this legislation and other sensible energy solutions put forth in this Congress.

Sooner or later, we are going to use common sense, we are going to start looking after our country and the American taxpayer, and we are going to get off this high horse of thinking we have all the answers, when we do have them here, and it is our American energy.

I hope to see this legislation and other sensible energy legislation and solutions put forth in this Congress. We have to do something. We can't keep punishing the American citizen and the American taxpayer, because if we keep our energy policies woke, we are going to go broke. This country is going to go flat broke. We are going to lose our farmers, we are going to lose small businesses, our prices are going to continue to rise, and it seems like nobody cares.

We better start taking care of the American people. If we unleash domestic production, we can produce clean energy, we can make it more affordable, and we can make life a lot simpler and better for the American people and also our allies. Let's wake up and smell the roses.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:38 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LUJÁN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

INFLATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about our economy.

The President has been doing a lot of bragging these days about the economy. Last week, it was Virginia. Later this week, it is Philadelphia. He is in New York City today. He is going to be here on Capitol Hill, down the hall, in the House, next Tuesday night, for the State of the Union.

You know, the American people that I talk to—and looking at statistics and poll numbers from around the country—the American people just don't believe the President has anything to brag about, not when you look at the economy that is facing our Nation today. Two-thirds of people in polls out this weekend say that they disapprove of the way Joe Biden is handling the economy—disapprove, doing a bad job, the country heading in the wrong direction. And it is really a problem when 70 percent of the people think the country in which they live, the country they love, is heading in the wrong direction.

Why would they say it? Well, they took a look at their own personal situation, because the average American family has lost more than \$10,000 to higher prices since Joe Biden took office just 2 years ago, and, now, what we are seeing across the country is more and more signs of the economy slowing down.

Last week, we found out that the economy had slowed down at the end of last year. Last year, the economy grew at only a rate of 2.1 percent for the entire year. The White House predicted that it would be 3.8 percent, so much below what the President and the White House had predicted. Actually, they missed it by almost half. And this is just the latest in a long list of disappointments that have affected the people all across the country over the last 2 years.

We found out Friday that consumer spending has dropped again. This week, working families are now getting another punch to the gut. Economists are predicting that the Federal Reserve is likely going to raise interest rates again in just 2 days. More rate hikes are going to make it even more expensive to borrow money. It is going to slow the economy down even further.

Over the last year, we have seen the largest rate hikes in 40 years. The average rate of new mortgages doubled since Joe Biden became President.

Credit card interest are at an all-time high. Higher rates, harder to buy a home, harder to buy a house, harder to pay off credit card debt—it is no surprise that mortgage applications recently hit their lowest level in 25 years. They say they can't afford it at these rates.

This is very bitter medicine for the American people to take because they have been living through the worst inflation in 40 years. So why do we have the worst inflation in 40 years? Well, it is obvious. It is the massive spending done by the Democrats on a strictly party-line basis and the fact that the Democrats shut down American energy. You talk about a one-two punch—trying to kill the American energy industry and massive amounts of spending on top of it, inflation at a 40-year high, people suffering all around the country.

Now, economists are predicting another recession coming this year. What does that mean? Well, it means more pain for people, more punishment for families who are just trying to get by or trying to put food on the table, and food prices have skyrocketed again.

The American dream is moving further and further out of reach for many, many American families. According to the Gallup poll group, faith in the American dream recently hit an all-time low. How could that happen? Record numbers of people, surprisingly, believe that their children will have a lower standard of living than they have had. That is not the way my parents looked at me when I was growing up or your parents did, Mr. President, when you were growing up. The American dream was about a better next generation. Parents today don't see that for their kids because they see what they see going around their communities and this country.

Many young people are giving up on their hope to buy a home someday. Families trying to get ahead are having a harder time, and many are falling behind.

It didn't have to be this way. Oh, no, this is the result of the decisions that Joe Biden made and the inflation that Joe Biden and the Democrats have brought about this country.

Remember, when Joe Biden took office just 2 years ago, inflation in this country was virtually nonexistent. A typical 30-year mortgage went for less than 4 percent. The lockdowns from the pandemic were coming to an end. The economy was ready to take off. And then in March of 2021, with every Democrat voting for it and every Republican voting against it, Democrats printed \$2 trillion and added it to the national debt.

Republicans warned the Democrats: Don't do it. Don't do this. Don't put the money. Don't spend the money. Don't add it to the debt.

We said it would cause inflation, and it wasn't just Republicans who were saying it. Democrats' own economic experts warned them: Don't spend the

money. It is going to jazz up the economy to the point of more money in. Prices are going to go chasing it, and prices will go up.

Democrat advisers, like former President Obama's advisers—Larry Summers, Jason Furman, and Steve Rattner, to just to name a few—Democrats in Washington, in this body, on this side of the floor, ignored the whole thing, refused to listen. NANCY PELOSI and the Democrats in the House said we don't want to hear it. They put their fingers in their ears.

A month after President Biden signed the bill, inflation climbed. We have been suffering the consequences ever since.

President Biden said: No, no, it is transitory. No, it is not inflation.

He had a hundred excuses. It was here, and it was here to stay, and the Democrats caused it.

To add problems on top of this, Democrats also raised taxes on nearly every tax bracket. Of course, this was a direct violation of the promises Joe Biden made to the American people. Democrats raised prices anyway.

Joe Biden went and gave an inaugural address where he talked like he was going to work together. It is not what happened.

He went to the White House and killed the Keystone XL Pipeline and went far, far to the left, raising taxes on American energy, raising taxes on natural gas. Natural gas powers about half the homes in the United States. Taxes on coal went up a billion dollars. That means everybody is paying higher prices.

It is strangling our economy. It is strangling our energy production. It is wrong for the Nation.

You look at Joe Biden. He is smiling away like things are going well, completely out of touch with the families all across the country.

We are still producing a lot less oil today than we were before the pandemic, and gas prices have gone up about 40 cents already this year. They are predicted to go to over \$4 a gallon by March because of the attack on American energy by this administration and this President.

Democrats have taken a sledgehammer to our economy on each and every side: higher taxes, higher spending, higher gas, less American energy. It is a Democrat policy in a nutshell. That is the Democrat economic policy: higher taxes, higher spending, higher debt, less American energy. It is a policy for failure, a policy for pain for American families.

I guess that is why, right now, today, in the United States Joe Biden is the least popular Democrat President in the last 60 years—the least popular. So instead of bragging, instead of going to New York and pounding his chest, as he did in Virginia and he is going to do in Pennsylvania—instead of bragging, he ought to be apologizing to the American people. He does owe the American people an apology for the damage and

the destruction that he has inflicted because of his radical leftwing policies.

His policies caused higher prices, caused higher interest rates, caused slower growth, caused much pain and much stress. So the American people are taking a look right now at the Biden economy, and they are not liking what they see. People want their money back. They want their future back. They want a future for their family.

So if Joe Biden won't apologize, which is what he should do when he comes to Congress next week for the State of the Union, then he should at least announce that he is going to change course, try to make things better, announce that he is going to stop this reckless spending that has brought us these problems, announce that he is finally going to unleash American energy so energy is affordable, available, and reliable.

That is what the American public is asking for and demanding. Working families in this country cannot afford any less.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I saw some exciting news this morning, and it said that General Motors announced it is making a \$650 million equity investment in Lithium Americas to develop the Thacker Pass Mine in Nevada. Now, this has been talked about for 10, 12, 13 years, but it is time to do something.

According to GM, this represents "the largest-ever investment by an automaker to produce battery raw materials," and that is exactly what the Inflation Reduction Act was meant to do. It is a tangible result because of that, and now, we have to make sure we follow through.

GM's CEO, Ms. Mary Barra, even said:

Direct sourcing critical [electric vehicles] raw materials and components from suppliers in North America and free-trade agreement countries helps make our supply chain more secure, helps us manage cell costs, and creates jobs.

This is really what we are dealing with. We are dealing with—basically, China has a captive market. I had a hard time understanding why our administration was going down a path of transitioning into electric vehicles as quickly as they intended and wanted to do without having our own secure supply chain.

China right now has 80 percent of the world's anode production, which is the positive and negative part of the battery that makes the battery work; 80 percent of the world's battery material processing, which is the processing of raw material that makes the batteries that run the vehicles we have; 60 percent of the world's cathode production; and 75 percent of the world's lithium ion battery cells.

I am old enough to remember—and maybe the Presiding Officer might be, too—that basically in 1974 I was standing in line waiting to buy gas, if it was my turn to buy gas, to go to work. I don't intend to stand in line to wait for China to send a battery to make my car work. I just won't do it. So this is why we are moving in the direction we are.

China has worked long and hard on cornering this market and done a very, very thorough job.

We have seen firsthand what Russia has done to the EU—to Europe, our allies—and most importantly, to Germany. They have used their production of energy—inexpensive, cheap energy—and let Europe and mostly Germany put their guard down and become totally dependent. Then Putin weaponized energy against them and put them in a heck of a stranglehold. Then basically decisions were being made about what they could do.

Well, the first thing they did was basically eliminate their dispatchable, dependable fuel, whether it be the coal-fired plants, which they had a desire to do, but they actively worked quicker than they had anything to replace it with and became more dependent. They got rid of their nuclear plants because their extreme environmental community wanted none of that; they wanted to go absolutely clean and green.

There will be a time probably—hopefully in our lifetime; maybe not, but in our children's lifetime—that all of this might be transitioned into a new carbonless fuel, but right now, we need an "all of the above" energy policy.

But they became totally dependent on cheap Russian gas, and they realized only after the invasion that they had made a mistake. Well, now they are scrambling to revive the very same coal-fired powerplants they shut down prematurely and bring back the nuclear reactors that they are going to need for a while.

People talk about the social cost of greenhouse gases, and I agree, there is a social cost, but we are not even talking about the geopolitical cost of inaction, being energy secure. That is really what this is all about.

The Inflation Reduction Act that we worked so hard on and every Democrat voted for in the House and the Senate, as the Presiding Officer knows, has been touted as an environmental bill. That is all you have heard. You have not heard the word from our administration talking about energy security.

The United States is the superpower of the world, and to remain that status, you have to have energy independence and be secure in your own energy sources.

If you recall, when all this happened and the invasion of Ukraine by Putin and basically the challenge we had and the high rising of oil prices to gasoline prices to everyday workers going back and forth—in my State, there is an awful lot of transit that goes on to secure your jobs. What had happened dur-

ing that period of time, our administration started saying: Well, maybe we can reduce the sanctions on Iran.

I said: You have the most prolific terrorist supporters in the world, and you want to lift sanctions so they can put more product into the market and make more money or have more revenue to wreak more havoc on humankind? I don't think that should be, I don't think that is a good idea, and I sure can't sign up for something such as that.

Then we allowed Venezuela, which basically has very little oversights on their environmental emissions—but we released that, and now they are putting product in the market.

Now, if we are so concerned about the environment, which we all should be, then shouldn't we basically look at what is going on? Is America just turning a blind eye and saying: Out of sight, out of mind.

We are asking other parts of the world to do what we won't do. We asked the Gulf States—Saudi Arabia—to produce more oil, put more oil into the marketplace, because that would stabilize the oil price, bring the price of gasoline down. We never asked our friends in Texas. We never asked our friends in Alaska. We never asked our best trading partner Canada to do more for us. We were seen asking other people—and pretty drastic measures, if you would, by other nations—to do something we didn't want to do for ourselves. I thought that was unattainable, it was just unrealistic, and it did not show the leadership of the superpower of the world.

Again, I will repeat this, and I will continue to repeat it: You will not maintain this status of being a superpower unless our allies look to us for help when they need it. We didn't have the energy to even be independent ourselves, let alone be able to help our allies as quickly as they needed it. We are getting up to speed now, we are coming back, and that is exactly what the Inflation Reduction Act was intended to do.

If we don't establish a domestic supply with the God-given resources that we have—we produce oil, we produce coal, and we produce natural gas environmentally better than anyplace else in the world. In the IRA, that bill was designed to have two tracks. For 10 years, we would have certainty that we would be energy independent by using everything above, and that means relying on the fossil fuels that we need, and we have, but we are going to do it better and cleaner than we have ever done it before. We put more money in carbon capture, sequestration, and utilization than ever before. We put more technology and fees on methane emission, which we know is harmful to the environment, than ever before. So basically we are leading the world and going to find the new technology we can share that makes the environment better. But if you can replace the dirty production of fossil with the cleaner production from the United States, that is

truly helping the environment. It is something that the leaders and the superpower of the world should be doing. We weren't in that position. We are fighting to get back.

But I have to watch now, after we passed a piece of legislation we all voted for—we are getting different interpretations from Treasury and other Agencies that have oversight, which is so wrong. That is not their job, to interpret what they want in a piece of legislation; their job is to basically enforce what we wrote in the legislation. And we said that we will be independent, that we will have our own supply of critical minerals. We will have our own supply, basically, and we are not going to have to depend on China for car batteries or anything else we need to run our economy. That is what we should be fighting for, and that is what we should all be considering that we should be doing.

The IRA is crystal clear. What the Department of the Treasury did is wrong. The law was very clear. By December 31 of last year, 2022, they were supposed to have the rules and regulations of how they would enforce the bill that we wrote. Well, guess what. They didn't. Now, guess what happened.

Let me explain to you how the law worked before. Before we did what we did with the IRA, the electric vehicles, the supplement that we gave, \$7,500, from 2008 after the crash of the economy, the banking crash that we had—there was a bill passed in 2008, a recovery bill, that was going to give \$7,500 credit to any manufacturer—I mean, any manufacturer—that sold an electric vehicle in the United States of America. Now, once they saturated and sold 200,000 cars, it was over; they got no more credits.

So let's look at our big manufacturers in the United States. We have General Motors, OK, we have basically Ford, and we have Toyota. Let me just tell you what has happened. So we are going to set the record straight because I had a discussion with my dear friend and colleague from Michigan, the Senator from Michigan, and we talked about that, and I think there was some misinterpretation or misspeaking about what has really happened.

As of last year, Tesla and—no, 2018. So that bill went into effect in 2008, and by 2018, Tesla and General Motors reached their cap of 200,000 cars. They weren't getting anymore \$7,500 if they sold a Tesla and if they sold a General Motors electric vehicle. And guess what. It didn't slow down the sales any. Tesla kept right on. They are past the million mark now and still going strong. So people want the product. We didn't have to give them Treasury or give them taxpayers' money to do it. General Motors hit their 200,000. Toyota reached theirs last year. Ford reached theirs September of last year. So all the major manufacturers. If we had not done the inflation reduction

bill and put in new guidelines, all the people who would have gotten the \$7,500 credit from American taxpayers were all foreign manufacturers sending electric vehicles to America. That is not right.

But now what happened is they picked and chose. So the Secretary of the Treasury—and we have had a conversation. We agree to disagree, and I disagree stronger than anyone's ever disagreed on something that they are doing that they shouldn't be doing. They are doing it wrong, and I will continue to fight and hold them accountable.

Last week, I introduced a bipartisan bill with Senator BRAUN that would do one simple thing. It would implement the law as intended by putting the sourcing provision in effect immediately, whether Treasury chooses to issue guidance or not.

I cannot pressure them to do their job on time, but I can do this: We can do our job. We wrote a piece of legislation, and we can make sure it takes effect when it was supposed to when they haven't done their job. They failed to do it. What we are going to say is, fine, and you implement it exactly the way you wrote the law.

What they are trying to do is this. They said: We don't have rules and regulations, but from January 1—and still going on—they are going to continue to give \$7,500 to everybody again. So they are opening it back up to General Motors. They are opening it back up to Tesla. They are opening it up to Toyota, to Ford. To everybody, it is opened up to start getting \$7,500 again.

Now, what they did, they chose out of our bill—the Inflation Reduction Act—they said: Yes, but if you make more than \$150,000, you are not qualified. That is exactly what is in our bill. But they said they don't have rules and regulations, but they took that part of it. They said: Well, if you buy a sedan that costs more than \$55,000, you don't qualify for the 7,500. If you buy a pickup truck that is more than 85,000, you don't qualify. That is all in our bill.

If you can't write your rules and regulations, but you can pick and choose what you like in the bill, that means you don't want to enforce the bill the way it was written. That is what we should not tolerate. That is not what anybody in this body should ever tolerate, to let the Agencies do exactly what they think they want to do to appease whomever they are trying to appease versus what we passed and the intent of what we passed.

That is what I am upset about, and that is why we are going to continue to fight.

And as it stands right now, they are cherry-picking, and they have completely cherry-picked, and other Agencies will do the same. This selective implementation is going to create a disadvantage for some automakers while giving more flexibility to others by allowing this to happen.

It is beyond being not right.

So let me tell you what we are going to do to make sure that the American people understand.

If you believe that we were wrong in passing that piece of legislation, then speak up. If you believe that we were wrong in saying that we should not be dependent on China, but you want to continue to have China dominating the market, you want them to have total control in a market that we are moving—it is the first time in the history of the United States that we have ever had to rely on a foreign supply chain for our transportation mode, whether it is trains, whether it is planes, whether it is automobiles, any form of transportation. We have been able to not have to depend on another foreign supply chain because we were able to do it in the United States.

We have allowed a lot of manufacturing to leave. We are bringing it back now.

So what we said basically in the bill was: You get \$3,750 credit toward an electric vehicle you bought from an American manufacturer, when the vehicle was manufactured in North America. That is the culmination between the United States, Canada, and Mexico, which is what NAFTA, which is what the USMCA, the new bill, that is what we do, has been moving those vehicles back and forth.

If it is manufactured here, you get 3,750. You get the first 3,750 if the selection of all the rare earth materials are selected from either North America or from countries that we have a free-trade agreement. And the reason that is done, we want to make sure that we have a secure channel for these rare earth minerals it takes to process and manufacture the battery.

So the processing, as far as the selection of the rare earth minerals, they have to come from either North America or our free-trade agreement countries. That gives us a solid supply. We are not dependent on China or Russia or any other nation that does not have our best interests and is not a democracy, does not have the same beliefs that we have for human rights and everything else that we do. We have that first, and then basically, it has to be manufactured in North America. Then you get the other 3,750.

So we use the \$7,500 as the carrot to reimplement ourselves into the manufacturing and self-reliance of our transportation mode. That is simply it.

I would hope everybody watching, listening, or anything else, as far as trying to get the knowledge of what we have done and what we have tried to do and what we are intending to make sure happens—which is to hold this administration, hold basically the Treasury Department and every other Agency that thinks that they can free will and just make up what they want and do what they want and pick regulations that they think that they would rather implement rather than implementing the law.

That is where we are. That is what I want is to set the record straight. First

of all, all the automakers in America who hit the 200,000 cap, this was a new lease on life for them—the IRA, selecting it, and I would quote, and I am going to read again from Mary Barra, who is the CEO of General Motors:

[The] [d]irect sourcing [of] critical EV raw materials and components from suppliers in North America and free-trade-agreement countries helps make our supply chain more secure, helps us manage cell costs, and creates jobs.

Now, that is one of our largest manufacturers of automobiles in the United States of America. If she thinks it is good for her company, if she thinks it is good for the American citizens and the car buyers in America, then it should be good enough that the bill should be implemented the way it was intended to. What we are going to do is reestablish ourselves: major manufacturing; not being reliant; superpower of the world—maintain that; have the energy sources; use our fossil, clean as anywhere in the world, for the next 10 years, as we are investing \$369 billion for the new technology of carbonless or carbon-free energy. Then that is leadership. That is what the world needs. That is what the world expects from the United States, and if we are going to maintain this world power, be the superpower of the world, we must maintain that leadership.

And it is tough at times, but we can do it. We have always done it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 184

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 184) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

Mr. DURBIN. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwith-

standing the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the traditional reading of Washington's Farewell Address take place on Monday, February 27, 2023, immediately following the prayer and reciting of the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR LANKFORD TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, as modified by the order of January 31, 2023, appoints the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. LANKFORD, to read Washington's Farewell Address on Monday, February 27, 2023.

MORNING BUSINESS

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 23-0A. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 17-65 of April 4, 2018.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSH,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 23-0A

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or CAPABILITY
(Sec. 36(b)(5)(C)), (AECA)

(i) Purchaser: Government of Spain.

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 17-65.

Date: April 4, 2018.

Implementing Agency: Army.

Funding Source: National Funds.

(iii) Description: On April 4, 2018, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 17-65, of the possible sale, under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of seventeen (17) CH-47F cargo helicopters with customer-unique modifications, twenty-one (21) Common Missile Warning System (CMWS) AN/AAR-57A(V)8, and forty-two (42) Embedded Global Positioning System (GPS) Inertial Navigation System (INS) (EGI). Also included were mission equipment, hardware and services required to implement customer-unique modifications, communication, Aircraft Survivability Equipment (ASE), and navigation equipment including AN/ARC-231 Multimode radios, AN/ARC-201D SINCGARS radios, AN/ARC-220 High Frequency (HF) Radio, Identification, Friend or Foe (IFF), AN/AAR-57A(V)8, and the Radar Signal Detecting Set (RSDS), AN/APR-39A(V)1, special tools and test equipment, ground support equipment, airframe and engine spare parts, technical data, publications, MWO/ECPs, technical assistance, transportation of aircraft and training, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total case value was \$1.3 billion. Major Defense Equipment (MDE) constituted \$900 million of this total.

This transmittal notifies the addition of the following MDE items:

—One (1) CH-47F Cargo Helicopter with customer-unique modifications;

—Two (2) Common Missile Warning Systems (CMWS) AN/AAR-57A(V)8

—Two (2) Embedded Global Positioning System (GPS) Inertial Navigation Systems (INS) (EGI)

Also included are equipment and services to support the new CH-47F cargo helicopter, as well as support the upgrade/remanufacturing of the previously notified, seventeen (17) cargo helicopters from CH-47D to CH-47F configuration, to include: mission equipment, hardware and services required to implement customer-unique modifications; communications equipment: Aircraft Survivability Equipment (ASE) and navigation equipment including: AN/ARC-231 Multimode radios, AN/ARC-201D SINCGARS radios, AN/ARC-220 High Frequency (HF) radios, Identification Friend or Foe (IFF), AN/AAR-57A(V)8, and the Radar Signal Detecting Set (RSDS); AN/APR-39A(V)1; special tools and test equipment; ground support equipment; airframe and engine spare parts; technical data; publications; Modification Work Order/Engineering Change Proposals (MWO/ECP); technical assistance, transportation of aircraft and training; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total value of the new items is \$913 million, but will not cause an increase in the total estimated program cost. The total estimated case value will remain \$1.3 billion with MDE remaining \$900 million of this total.

(iv) Significance: This notification is being provided as the additional MDE items were not enumerated in the original notification. The proposed sale will support Spain's capability to strengthen its homeland defense and deter regional threats. This additional aircraft will also enhance Spain's commitment and contribution to NATO in providing a Combat Aviation Brigade.

(v) Justification: This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of a NATO ally which is an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe. It is vital to the

U.S. national interest to assist Spain in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology: The statement contained in the original AECA 36(b)(1) transmittal applies to the MDE items reported here.

(vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: January 25, 2023

NORWAY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise to mark the new security cooperation agreement through the Department of Defense's State Partnership Program between the Minnesota National Guard and the Kingdom of Norway, which will be celebrated in Minnesota on Saturday, February 4, 2023. This partnership will provide a key avenue to deter aggression and assist in both of our nation's national security while broadening and deepening our long-standing relationship.

Norway has been critical to Minnesota's heritage and culture ever since the first Norwegian settlement was established in Spring Grove back in the early 1850s, a few years before Minnesota officially became a State. Today, Minnesota is the proud home of more than 860,000 Norwegian Americans. Some of our most beloved Minnesotans have been of Norwegian ancestry, including my late friend and mentor, Vice President Walter Mondale. At the end of last year, we had the honor of welcoming Her Majesty Queen Sonja to Minneapolis to celebrate the opening of Norway House's new Innovation and Cultural Center.

In addition to our cultural heritage, Minnesota and Norway share a strong, time-tested military relationship. In 1973, Norwegian Home Guard's Major General Herluf Nygaard invited the chief of the National Guard, Major General Francis S. Greenlief, to visit their Home Guard. What came out of that meeting was the Norwegian Reciprocal Troop Exchange, also known as NOREX.

Through this program, members of the Minnesota National Guard and the Norwegian Home Guard have gotten the opportunity to participate in field training exercises with an appropriate emphasis on winter tactical training. For Minnesota guardsmen, it has meant skiing through the mountains of Norway and sleeping in tents and snow shelters. For Norway's soldiers, it has meant winter training at Camp Ripley. Every participant is taken in as a guest by a local family, making NOREX a true cultural exchange.

For 50 years, the program has strengthened the militaries of both our nations while fostering goodwill and lifelong friendships. This new State Partnership Program brings with it the opportunity to build on that progress while offering reassurance to our friends throughout the globe and deterring our foes. This partnership will promote and deepen trust, familiarity, and interoperability between Minnesota and Norway.

Norway is one of Minnesota's best friends around the world. They have stood with us. We have stood with them. And we will continue to stand together. Our friendship is unshakeable. Our progress toward initiating this new State Partnership Program is a testament to that.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, for myself as chairman of the Select Committee on Ethics and for Senator Lankford, vice chairman of the committee, that the Annual Report of the Select Committee on Ethics for calendar year 2022 be printed in the Record. The committee issued this report on January 31, 2023, as required by the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS,
January 31, 2023.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

118TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

The Honest Leadership and Open Government Act of 2007 (the Act) calls for the Select Committee on Ethics of the United States Senate to issue an annual report no later than January 31st of each year providing information in certain categories describing its activities for the preceding year. Reported below is the information describing the Committee's activities in 2022 in the categories set forth in the Act:

(1) The number of alleged violations of Senate rules received from any source, including the number raised by a Senator or staff of the Committee—92. (In addition, 10 alleged violations from previous years were carried into 2022.)

(2) The number of alleged violations that were dismissed—

(A) For lack of subject matter jurisdiction or in which, even if the allegations in the complaint are true, no violation of Senate rules would exist: 72.

(B) Because they failed to provide sufficient facts as to any material violation of the Senate rules beyond mere allegation or assertion: 8.

(3) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry: 22. (This figure includes 10 matters from previous years carried into 2022.)

(4) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry that resulted in an adjudicatory review: 0.

(5) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry and the Committee dismissed the matter for lack of substantial merit or because it was inadvertent, technical or otherwise of a *de minimis* nature: 15.

(6) The number of alleged violations for which the Committee staff conducted a preliminary inquiry and the Committee issued private or public letters of admonition: 1.

(7) The number of matters resulting in a disciplinary sanction: 0.

(8) Any other information deemed by the Committee to be appropriate to describe its activities in the previous year:

In 2022, the Committee staff conducted 24 Member and office campaign activity briefings; 15 employee code of conduct training sessions; 2 public financial disclosure clinics, seminars, and webinars; 10 ethics seminars and customized briefings for Member DC offices, state offices, and Senate committees; 1 private sector ethics briefing, and 1 international briefing.

In 2022, the Committee staff handled approximately 8,966 inquiries (via telephone and email) for ethics advice and guidance.

In 2022, the Committee wrote approximately 778 ethics advisory letters and responses including, but not limited to, 584 travel and gifts matters (Senate Rule 35) and 160 conflict of interest matters (Senate Rule 37).

In 2022, the Committee received 4,031 public financial disclosure and periodic disclosure of financial transactions reports.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING SCOTT LABARRE

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I rise to honor the life and career of my dear friend Scott LaBarre on the sad occasion of his death after a battle with cancer. Scott passed away surrounded by his family on Saturday, December 10, 2022.

From his days as a college student until a few months before his death, Scott, who went blind as a youth, fought tirelessly for the rights of blind people and other people with disabilities.

Born and raised in Minnesota, Scott attended the Colorado Center for the Blind, a world-renowned rehabilitation training program for blind people, and ultimately established his law practice and his family in the Denver area.

His legal work focused in the areas of employment law, disability rights, and international copyright policy. He held several leadership positions within the American Bar Association and the National Federation of the Blind—NFB—most recently as NFB's general counsel.

He served as chair of the board of the Colorado Center for the Blind, led the National Association of Blind Lawyers, and helped establish and guide the Jacobus tenBroek Law Symposium, the premier conference for practitioners and students of disability law.

His impact will continue to ripple across the world because of his leadership in securing the Marrakesh Treaty, an international agreement permitting the cross-border sharing of books in Braille and other accessible formats, which was ratified by this body.

Scott conducted all of his work with confidence, humor, and a joyful spirit. Going forward, I will miss his presence in the halls of the Senate when the National Federation of the Blind visits Washington each year, as well as my many other interactions with him.

I am sure that many of you also encountered Scott, and I know you will join me in lifting up his wife Anahit and their children, Alex and Carter, as they cope with this devastating loss.

I take comfort in the knowledge that Scott leaves a legacy encompassing not only his many accomplishments, but his impact on the hundreds of blind people whom he personally mentored and the millions who will benefit from his efforts for generations to come.●

TRIBUTE TO BRAD GIOIA

● Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of Senator BLACKBURN and myself to honor the legacy and impact of Brad Gioia's 29 years of service as the head of school for Montgomery Bell Academy.

Since Brad was called to serve the MBA community nearly three decades ago, he has grown the preparatory school into a world-renowned institution. MBA's mission is to "provide each student with the tools to reach his maximum potential as a gentleman, a scholar, and an athlete." Brad Gioia has dedicated himself to fulfilling this mission. Senator BLACKBURN and I are honored to recognize his great service.

During the past 29 years, Brad has grown MBA's student population by two-thirds, increased the school's budget by 1,100 percent, and quadrupled the school's endowment. Most impressively, he has developed the comprehensive Wilson Grant program, which has sent hundreds of students to study and serve others all over the world.

Throughout his tenure, Brad has been a constant figure of support, dedication, and commitment to the students of MBA. He created a culture of support where all boys are celebrated when they excel, whether it is in academics, athletics, music, art, debate, mock trial, service, or theater. The strong sense of community that Brad Gioia built at MBA will reverberate for decades to come, and our community is forever grateful for his selfless service to the thousands of young MBA men over the years.

His dedication to the MBA community and the greater Nashville community will be missed, and his legacy will not be forgotten. On behalf of Senator BLACKBURN and the entire Nashville community, I thank you for your tireless years of service as the head of school for Montgomery Bell Academy. We wish you, Minna, Christopher, and Gabby all the best as you enter the next chapter of your life.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Kelly, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations

which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:39 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 290. An act to provide for transparent licensing of commercial remote sensing systems, and for other purposes.

H.R. 298. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for rural-area small businesses, and for other purposes.

H.R. 342. An act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require reporting relating to certain cost-share requirements, and for other purposes.

H.R. 500. An act to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to postpone the date of payment or satisfaction upon redemption of certain securities in the case of the financial exploitation of specified adults, and for other purposes.

H.R. 582. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the United States Group of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly: Mr. Guthrie of Kentucky, Mr. Dunn of Florida, Mr. Bergman of Michigan, Mrs. Wagner of Missouri, Mr. Fitzpatrick of Pennsylvania, and Mr. McCormick of Georgia.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 290. An act to provide for transparent licensing of commercial remote sensing systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 298. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to expand access to capital for rural-area small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 342. An act to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require reporting relating to certain cost-share requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 500. An act to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to postpone the date of payment or satisfaction upon redemption of certain securities in the case of the financial exploitation of specified adults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 582. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 184. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-146. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Internet Communication Disclaimers and Definition of 'Public Communication'" (Notice 2022-22) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-147. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to fifteen (15) legislative recommendations received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-148. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to fifteen (15) legislative recommendations; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-149. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Territory and Airspace of Somalia" ((RIN2120-AL78) (Docket No. FAA-2022-27602)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-150. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment and Establishment of United States Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Eastern United States, NY" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0906)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-151. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 569" ((RIN2120-AA63) (Docket No. 31462)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-152. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4036" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31459)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-173. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes: Amendment 39-22258" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0833)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-194. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes; Amendment 39-22290" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1238)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-195. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Improving 911 Reliability; Amendments to Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications; New Part 4 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Disruptions to Communications" (PS Docket Nos. 15-80, 13-75 and ET Docket No. 04-35) (FCC 22-50)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-196. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "In the Matter of Amendment of Section 1.80(b) of the Commission's Rules Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties to Reflect Inflation" (DA Docket No. 22-1356) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-197. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39-22246" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1158)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-198. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment and Establishment of United States Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Eastern United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0906)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-199. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment and Removal of VOR Federal Airways in the Eastern United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0940)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-200. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of United States Navigation (RNAV) Route T-266; Juneau, AK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1106)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-201. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment and Revocation of Multiple Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route; and Revocation of the Pawnee City, NE, Low Altitude Reporting Point in the Vicinity of Pawnee

City, NE" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0712)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-202. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment and Establishment of United States Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Eastern United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0906)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-203. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment and Amendment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Eastern United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0858)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-204. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment and Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Northeast United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0826)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-205. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment and Establishment of United States Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Northeast United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0826)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-206. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Domestic VOR Federal Airway V-356; Mile High, CO" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0027)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-207. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Federal Airway V-573 and Area Navigation (RNAV) Route 398 in the Vicinity of Sulphur Springs, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0617)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-208. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class C Airspace; Manchester, NH" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1472))

received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-209. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Christmas Valley Airport, OR; CORRECTION" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1472)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-210. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Brookings Airport, Brookings, OR" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1031)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-211. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace; Boozman Yellowstone International Airport, MT; CORRECTION" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0764)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-212. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D Airspace and Class E Airspace; East Hampton and Montauk, NY" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1545)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-213. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Christmas Valley Airport, OR" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0571)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-214. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Montpelier, VT" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0376)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-215. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class C Airspace; Manchester, NH" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1472)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-216. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class D Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Butts Army Airfield (AAF) (Fort Carson) Airport, CO” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0797)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-217. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Montpelier, VT” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0376)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-218. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class D Airspace; Fort Belvoir, VA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1447)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-219. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Oneonta, NY” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1073)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-220. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Amber 4 (A-4); Anaktuvuk Pass, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0078)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-221. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Proposed Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Blue (B-79); Annette Island, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0109)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-222. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Blue 7 (B-7) and Green 9 (G-9); Bethel, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0186)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-223. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Green 7 (G-7); Nome, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0301)) received during adjournment

of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-224. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Green 15 (G-15); St. Mary’s, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0162)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-225. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Amber 6 (A-6); St. Mary’s, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0299)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-226. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Red 1 (R-1) Vicinity of King Salmon, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0765)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-227. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Green 17 (G-17); Atkasuk, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0539)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-228. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Amber 5 (A-5) and Blue 4 (B-4); Bettles, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0172)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-229. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Blue 26 (B-26); Fort Yukon, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0110)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-230. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Blue 37 (B-37); Level Island, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0312)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-231. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Red 51 (R-51); Level Island, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0120)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-232. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Amber 2 (A-2); Northway, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0120)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-233. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Blue 8 (B-8); Shishmaref, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0300)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-234. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Green 18 (G-18); Point Lay, AK” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-0165)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-235. A communication from the Program Analyst, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “In the Matter of Process Reform for Executive Branch Review of Certain FCC Applications and Petitions Involving Foreign Ownership” ((IB Docket Nos. 22-271 and 18-313) (FCC 22-74)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-236. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Television Broadcasting Services; Norwell, Massachusetts” ((MB Docket No. 22-376)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-237. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Television Broadcasting Services; Memphis, TN” ((MB Docket No. 22-146)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-238. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Television Broadcasting Services; Chicago, Illinois” ((MB Docket No. 22-546)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the

President of the Senate on January 19, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-239. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Rule; Technical Amendments; Miscellaneous Amendments" ((RIN2120-AL53) (FAA-2022-1355)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 19, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-240. A communication from the Executive Director, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, transmitting, pursuant to Section 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, the Office's annual reports containing recommendations regarding the applicability to the legislative branch of Federal laws and regulations concerning workplace rights, safety and health, and public access, received in the office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committees on Rules and Administration; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-241. A communication from the Executive Director, Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, transmitting, pursuant to Section 301(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, the Office's annual reports regarding covered payments from the account described in section 415(a) of the Act that were the result of claims alleging a violation of part A of title II of the Act; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-2. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan requesting the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress approve the replacement of Michigan's statue of Lewis Cass with a statue of Coleman A. Young as part of the National Statuary Hall Collection and to take other actions related to this request; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 23

Whereas, Congress authorized the creation of the National Statuary Hall Collection in 1864 to provide an opportunity for each state to honor two distinguished people with statues at the U.S. Capitol Currently, Lewis Cass and Gerald Ford represent the state of Michigan in the collection. The statues were placed in the U.S. Capitol in 1889 and 2011, respectively, and

Whereas, Federal law establishes a process by which states may request the replacement of a statue located in the National Statuary Hall Collection. The first step in the process is the state legislature adopting a resolution identifying the statue to replace and the person to be honored with a new statue, selecting the entity responsible for choosing the sculptor, and directing the method of obtaining funds to cover the necessary costs of the replacement. Federal law also requires that the state's governor submit a written request to provide a new statue to the Architect of the Capitol along with a description of the location in the state where the replaced statue will be displayed after it is transferred, and a copy of the resolution authorizing the replacement, and

Whereas, A statue of Lewis Cass was placed in the U.S. Capitol on behalf of Michigan in

the late 19th century in recognition of his service to the state of Michigan and United States Lewis Cass served as a Governor of the Michigan territory, U.S. Senator from Michigan, U.S. Secretary of War, U.S. Secretary of State, and U.S. Ambassador to France during his career, and

Whereas, Honoring Lewis Cass with a statue in the National Statuary Hall Collection is no longer consistent with the values of the people of Michigan While Lewis Cass was an accomplished public figure, he played a prominent role in the implementation of President Andrew Jackson's Indian removal policy, was a proponent of allowing states and territories to permit slavery, and enslaved at least one person himself, and

Whereas, Coleman A. Young was the first African-American mayor of Detroit and one of the most accomplished leaders in Michigan's largest city's history. Young served his country as a bombardier and navigator with the Tuskegee Airmen during World War II. He demonstrated an early interest in justice and fairness, spearheading a protest against the exclusion of Blacks from segregated officers' clubs. Young became a union activist after the war and was elected to the Michigan Senate serving for nine years. The people of Detroit elected him as their mayor for the first time in 1973, reelecting him four times over the next two decades. Young was known for championing needs of the city's Black community and for building coalitions among its business leaders. Under his leadership, the city saw the completion of a number of major projects, such as the Renaissance Center, Detroit People Mover, and Joe Louis Arena. Young's contributions to the city of Detroit, and our entire state make him deserving of a place in the National Statuary Hall Collection, and

Whereas, The Michigan Statuary Hall Commission will select the sculptor and secure funding for this project; Now, therefore, be it *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives Concurring)*, That we request the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress approve the replacement of Michigan's statue of Louis Cass with a statue of Coleman A. Young as part of the National Statuary Hall Collection; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Governor to communicate approval of this replacement to the Architect of the Capitol and to sign an agreement with the Architect of the Capitol to replace the Lewis Cass statue with one of Coleman A. Young; and be it further

Resolved, That we hereby establish the Michigan Statuary Hall Commission. The commission will select an artist to sculpt the statue of Coleman A. Young. The commission shall be made up of five members, with one member appointed by each of the Governor, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senate Majority Leader the House Minority Leader, and the Senate Minority Leader; and be it further

Resolved, That the costs of this entire project, including the costs of creating, transporting, and placing both statues at their respective locations and the costs related to ceremonies that may be held in Lansing and Washington, D.C., will be paid for by donations and other funding secured by the Michigan Statuary Hall Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor, the Architect of the Capitol, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, and the members of the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 155. A bill to ensure that employees of the Internal Revenue Service are brought back to their offices until the backlog of income tax returns has been eliminated; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. LEE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. THUNE, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 156. A bill to expand the use of E-Verify to hold employers accountable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 157. A bill to prevent the misuse of drones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 158. A bill to increase United States jobs through greater United States exports to Africa and Latin America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LANKFORD, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from gross income for mandatory restitution or civil damages as recompense for trafficking in persons; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 160. A bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 161. A bill to extend the Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 162. A bill to amend the Smith River National Recreation Area Act to include certain additions to the Smith River National

Recreation Area, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain wild rivers in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. TUBERVILLE):

S. 163. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove short-barreled rifles, short-barreled shotguns, and certain other weapons from the definition of firearms for purposes of the National Firearms Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 164. A bill to prohibit the consideration of COVID-19 vaccination status in determining eligibility for organ donation or transplantation, and in providing services to Medicare or Medicaid beneficiaries; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LEE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 165. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal and local funds to impose or enforce a COVID-19 vaccine mandate in District of Columbia schools, and to repeal the Coronavirus Immunization of School Students and Early Childhood Workers Regulation Amendment Act of 2021 enacted by the District of Columbia Council; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. VANCE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 166. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave for the spontaneous loss of an unborn child, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 167. A bill to prohibit vaccination mandates for COVID-19; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 168. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to include the Secretary of Agriculture on the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States and require review of certain agricultural transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 169. A bill to prohibit certain COVID-19 vaccination mandates for minors, and to require parental consent for COVID-19 vaccination of minors; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 170. A bill to establish a Joint Select Committee on Afghanistan to conduct a full investigation and compile a joint report on the United States withdrawal from Afghanistan; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 171. A bill to prohibit the consideration of patients' race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, vaccination status, veteran status, or political ideology or speech in determining eligibility for

COVID-19 treatments and vaccines distributed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 172. A bill to terminate any existing mask mandates imposed by the Federal Government, to prevent the implementation of new mask mandates, to preserve individual liberty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. COONS, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KING, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. WELCH):

S. 173. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 174. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to improve the conservation reserve program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 175. A bill to codify certain public land orders relating to the revocation of certain withdrawals of public land in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Ms. SMITH, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 176. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to extend and expand the Market Access Program and the Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 177. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to provide grants to reduce the quantity of food waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 178. A bill to establish protections for passengers in air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 179. A bill to require the designation of composting as a conservation practice and activity, to provide grants and loan guarantees for composting facilities and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 180. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2023, to improve disaster relief funding for agricultural producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 181. A bill to protect individual liberty, ensure privacy, and prohibit discrimination with respect to the vaccination status of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 182. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk middle school students with the transition from middle school to high school; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 183. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, to add a work-study program for off-campus community service at selected after-school activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. LEE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. YOUNG, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 184. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; read the first time.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 185. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the program for direct housing loans made to Native American veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 186. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from promoting, supporting, or contracting with abortion entities, or otherwise expanding access to abortions on Federal lands or in Federal facilities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 187. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the trade or business expense deduction for the reimbursement of employee costs of child gender transition procedure or travel to obtain an abortion; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 188. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to select and implement landscape-scale forest restoration projects, to assist communities in increasing their resilience to wildfire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 189. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to require the contractual provision by large issuers of procedural privileges with respect to certain shareholder claims relating to board and management accountability for "woke" social policy actions as a condition of listing on a national securities exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 190. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit exports of crude and refined oil and certain petroleum products to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ,

Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 191. A bill to eliminate the position of the Chief Diversity Officer of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 192. A bill to criminalize the intentional destruction of roadways on the Interstate System; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 193. A bill to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect students from racial hostility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 194. A bill to prohibit the disbursement of Federal funds to State and local governments that allow individuals who are not citizens of the United States to vote in any Federal, State, or local election; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 195. A bill to provide compensation to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community for the taking without just compensation of land by the United States inside the exterior boundaries of the L'Anse Indian Reservation that were guaranteed to the Community under a treaty signed in 1854, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 196. A bill to prohibit the declaration of a Federal emergency relating to abortion; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 197. A bill to permanently enact certain appropriations Act restrictions on the use of funds for abortions and involuntary sterilizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VANCE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. ROMNEY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. ERNST, and Mrs. BRITT):

S.J. Res. 5. A joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 20. A resolution condemning the coup that took place on February 1, 2021, in

Burma and the Burmese military's detention of civilian leaders, calling for an immediate and unconditional release of all those detained, promoting accountability and justice for those killed by the Burmese military, and calling for those elected to serve in parliament to resume their duties without impediment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 10

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 10, a bill to improve the workforce of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 18

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 18, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit discrimination by abortion against an unborn child on the basis of Down syndrome.

S. 32

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 32, a bill to increase the number of landlords participating in the Housing Choice Voucher program.

S. 37

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 37, a bill to require the Attorney General to make competitive grants to State, tribal, and local governments to establish and maintain witness protection and assistance programs.

S. 75

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 75, a bill to ensure equal treatment for religious organizations in the Federal provision of social services programs, grantmaking, and contracting, and for other purposes.

S. 81

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 81, a bill to provide a moratorium on all Federal research grants provided to any institution of higher education or other research institute that is conducting gain-of-function research.

S. 82

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 82, a bill to protect social security benefits and military pay and require that the United States Government to prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached.

S. 111

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 111, a bill to require each agency, in providing notice of a rule making, to include a link to a 100-word plain language summary of the proposed rule.

S. 122

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 122, a bill to establish the Payroll Audit Independent Determination program in the Department of Labor.

S. 127

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 127, a bill to prevent unfair and deceptive acts or practices and the dissemination of false information related to pharmacy benefit management services for prescription drugs, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 2, a concurrent resolution commending the bravery, courage, and resolve of the women and men of Iran demonstrating in more than 133 cities and risking their safety to speak out against the Iranian regime's human rights abuses.

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 2, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 158. A bill to increase United States jobs through greater United States exports to Africa and Latin America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 158

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Increasing American Jobs Through Greater United States Exports to Africa and Latin America Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. INVESTMENT, TRADE, AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish a comprehensive United States strategy for public and private investment, trade, and development in Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean.

(2) FOCUS OF STRATEGY.—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall focus on increasing exports of United States goods and services to Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean by 200 percent in real dollar value

by the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) CONSULTATIONS.—In developing the strategy required by paragraph (1), the President shall consult with—

- (A) Congress;
- (B) each agency that is a member of the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee;
- (C) the relevant multilateral development banks, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the respective United States Executive Directors of such banks;
- (D) each agency that participates in the Trade Policy Staff Committee established;
- (E) the President's Export Council;
- (F) each of the development agencies;
- (G) any other Federal agencies with responsibility for export promotion or financing and development; and

(H) the private sector, including businesses, nongovernmental organizations, and African and Latin American and Caribbean diaspora groups.

(4) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

(A) STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress the strategy required by subsection (a).

(B) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the strategy required by paragraph (1).

(b) SPECIAL AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN EXPORT STRATEGY COORDINATORS.—The President shall designate an individual to serve as Special Africa Export Strategy Coordinator and an individual to serve as Special Latin America and the Caribbean Export Strategy Coordinator—

(1) to oversee the development and implementation of the strategy required by subsection (a); and

(2) to coordinate developing and implementing the strategy with—

(A) the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee;

(B) the Assistant United States Trade Representative for African Affairs or the Assistant United States Trade Representative for the Western Hemisphere, as appropriate;

(C) the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs or the Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs, as appropriate;

(D) the Export-Import Bank of the United States;

(E) the United States International Development Finance Corporation; and

(F) the development agencies.

(c) TRADE MISSIONS TO AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.—It is the sense of Congress that, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce and other high-level officials of the United States Government with responsibility for export promotion, financing, and development should conduct joint trade missions to Africa and to Latin America and the Caribbean.

(d) TRAINING.—The President shall develop a plan—

(1) to standardize the training received by United States and Foreign Commercial Service officers, economic officers of the Department of State, and economic officers of the United States Agency for International Development with respect to the programs and procedures of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the United States International Development Finance Corporation, the Small Business Administration, and the United States Trade and Development Agency; and

(2) to ensure that, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) all United States and Foreign Commercial Service officers that are stationed over-

seas receive the training described in paragraph (1); and

(B) in the case of a country to which no United States and Foreign Commercial Service officer is assigned, any economic officer of the Department of State stationed in that country receives that training.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES.—The term “development agencies” means the United States Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the United States International Development Finance Corporation, the United States Trade and Development Agency, the United States Department of Agriculture, and relevant multilateral development banks.

(2) MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS.—The term “multilateral development banks” has the meaning given that term in section 1701(c)(4) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)(4)) and includes the African Development Foundation.

(3) TRADE POLICY STAFF COMMITTEE.—The term “Trade Policy Staff Committee” means the Trade Policy Staff Committee established pursuant to section 2002.2 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) TRADE PROMOTION COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—The term “Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee” means the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee established under section 2312 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4727).

(5) UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE.—The term “United States and Foreign Commercial Service” means the United States and Foreign Commercial Service established by section 2301 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4721).

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 174. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to improve the conservation reserve program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 174

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Conservation Reserve Program Improvement Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) STATE ACRES FOR WILDLIFE ENHANCEMENT CONTINUOUS ENROLLMENT.—Section 1231(d)(6)(A)(i) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(d)(6)(A)(i)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (II), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(IV) land that will be enrolled under the State acres for wildlife enhancement practice established by the Secretary; and”.

(b) COST SHARING PAYMENTS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF GRAZING INFRASTRUCTURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1234(b)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834(b)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking “establishing water” and inserting the following: “establishing—

“(A) water”;

(B) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) grazing infrastructure, including interior cross fencing, perimeter fencing, and water infrastructure (such as rural water connections, water wells, pipelines, and water tanks), under each contract, for all practices, if grazing is included in the conservation plan and addresses a resource concern.”.

(2) REENROLLMENT OF LAND WITH GRAZING INFRASTRUCTURE.—Section 1231(h) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) LAND WITH GRAZING INFRASTRUCTURE.—On the expiration of a contract entered into under this subchapter that covers land that includes grazing infrastructure established with cost sharing assistance under section 1234(b)(1)(B)—

“(A) the Secretary shall consider that land to be planted for purposes of subsection (b)(1)(B); and

“(B) that land shall be eligible for reenrollment in the conservation reserve, subject to the requirements of this subchapter.”.

(c) MID-CONTRACT MANAGEMENT FOR ACTIVITIES NOT RELATING TO HAYING OR GRAZING.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MANAGEMENT.—Section 1232(a)(5) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3832(a)(5)) is amended by inserting “(as defined in section 1231A(a))” after “management”.

(2) MANAGEMENT PAYMENTS.—Section 1234(b)(2) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) MANAGEMENT PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall make cost sharing payments to an owner or operator under this subchapter for any management activity described in section 1232(a)(5), except for those management activities relating to haying or grazing.”.

(d) PAYMENT LIMITATION FOR RENTAL PAYMENTS.—Section 1234(g)(1) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3834(g)(1)) is amended by striking “\$50,000” and inserting “\$125,000”.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 188. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to select and implement landscape-scale forest restoration projects, to assist communities in increasing their resilience to wildfire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of the Wildfire Emergency Act, bipartisan legislation that Senators PADILLA, DAINES, WYDEN, and I are introducing today, to help address the threat of catastrophic wildfire throughout the West.

Wildfires have always been a part of life in California and other Western States, but climate change and drier forests have increased the threat of catastrophic wildfire. The new fire season is nearly year-round, and the wildfires themselves are more destructive as they spread faster and burn hotter.

The new reality of the wildfire threat requires transformative action to protect our forests and neighboring communities. Our bill would do just that, empowering Federal, State, and local land managers to make both our forests and infrastructure more resilient.

The most recent National Climate Assessment, conducted by leading scientists from the research community and across the Federal Government, found that the number of acres burned in the Western United States is double what would have burned without climate change.

My home State of California knows this all too well as it is the epicenter of this destructive phenomenon. The top three worst wildfire seasons in California were all in the last 5 years, including the largest single wildfire in California history in 2021. Since 2017, wildfires have burned more than 11 million acres, killed nearly 200 people, and destroyed more than 32,000 homes.

Worryingly, these wildfires are predicted to only grow worse as climate conditions continue to change, and the Federal Government has not yet adequately responded. Important investments in wildfire resilience were included in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the Inflation Reduction Act, which were enacted in the last Congress, but stakeholders are nearly unanimous in supporting additional policy changes to improve the pace and scale of wildfire resiliency treatments.

At the same time, the urgency of this crisis should not prompt Congress to vitiate important environmental safeguards. Throughout my time in the Senate, I have consistently championed the preservation and careful stewardship of our treasured forests, and this bill will be no different.

Our Wildfire Emergency Act is the result of a considered approach to the wildfire crisis and includes feedback from conservationists, public and private stakeholders, and the U.S. Forest Service.

First, it would provide the U.S. Forest Service with a pilot authority to leverage private financing options to increase the pace and scale of forest restoration projects. These projects would involve a collaborative approach to forest management to ensure that the forests are protected.

This conservation finance model would be a new way of implementing forest restoration work, but the principle at its core is that forests are vital to a healthy environment and populace. Forests provide shade and wind breaks, stabilize steep mountain slopes, and help purify our water. These benefits have tangible value, and the financing model we develop here would make those benefits plain for all to see.

In addition, the bill makes energy resilience a priority across the Federal Government. It would help develop and fund backup power for critical infrastructure like drinking water or hospitals, and put a renewed focus on wildfire detection and monitoring. As vulnerable as our forests are, it takes just one spark to ignite an entire mountain. The sooner our firefighters can detect and respond to these fires, the better our chances of preventing more communities from devastation.

In addition, the bill would provide grants to low-income households to make fire-resilient upgrades to their homes. Thanks to home insurance regulatory changes taking place in California, wildfire retrofits could also help lower insurance premiums and reduce the financial burden on rural homeowners. The bill would also make grants available to low-income communities to help involve them in planning and implementing forest restoration projects on the lands surrounding their homes.

Lastly, our bill recognizes that the forest management workforce is also in crisis. The U.S. Forest Service and Department of Interior have experience chronic staffing shortages in wildland firefighters for years. And even though the bipartisan infrastructure law and Inflation Reduction Act provided historic levels of funding for forest conservation work, the Bureau of Labor Statistics predicts an overall decline in the forest conservation workforce in the next 10 years.

To address these issues, our bill would create new funding sources for forest management education and firefighter training. It would also establish a prescribed fire training center in the Western United States, to train the next generation of firefighters and forestry technicians in the landscapes where their skills are most needed.

The simple reality is that wildfires will continue to happen in the West. They are an integral part of the West's ecology, even if climate change has exacerbated their scale and intensity. Our job must be to prepare for these wildfires to the extent we are able, to use the best available science to make our forests more resilient, and ensure that our communities remain safe.

That is why Senators PADILLA, DAINES, WYDEN, and I have introduced this bill today, and I urge my colleagues to support and pass it as soon as possible.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 20—CONDEMNING THE COUP THAT TOOK PLACE ON FEBRUARY 1, 2021, IN BURMA AND THE BURMESE MILITARY'S DETENTION OF CIVILIAN LEADERS, CALLING FOR AN IMMEDIATE AND UNCONDITIONAL RELEASE OF ALL THOSE DETAINED, PROMOTING ACCOUNTABILITY AND JUSTICE FOR THOSE KILLED BY THE BURMESE MILITARY, AND CALLING FOR THOSE ELECTED TO SERVE IN PARLIAMENT TO RESUME THEIR DUTIES WITHOUT IMPEDIMENT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 20

Whereas, on February 1, 2021, the Burmese military and its aligned Union Solidarity and Development Party (USDP) conducted a coup against the civilian government hours before Parliament was to convene in a new session, resulting in the military junta illegally detaining State Counsellor Aung San Suu Kyi, President Win Myint, and members of Parliament, as well as pro-democracy activists from the 88 Generation and other civil society leaders;

Whereas, since February 1, 2021, the Burmese military has detained more than 13,000 people for exercising their rights of freedom of speech and assembly and killed more than 2,800 civilians, including children;

Whereas the Burmese military put the democratically elected civilian leadership of Burma, including President Win Myint and State Counsellor Aung San Suu Kyi, through sham trials for fabricated crimes and sentenced them to lengthy prison terms in order to remove them from political competition;

Whereas Aung San Suu Kyi was sentenced to 33 years in prison for multiple spurious charges;

Whereas the Burmese military has become the world's second largest detainer of journalists, with over 100 journalists imprisoned since the coup;

Whereas the Burmese military's actions have driven hundreds of thousands from their homes and driven thousands to flee across Burma's borders into Thailand, India, and Bangladesh;

Whereas fighting between the Burmese military and several ethnic armed groups continues, with government forces committing increasingly violent abuses against ethnic Karen, Kayah, Kachin, Chin, Rakhine, Shan, and Rohingya minority populations;

Whereas the Burmese military restricted freedom of movement, telecommunications, and the media, limiting access to information to and from Burma during the COVID-19 pandemic, which exacerbated the political crisis initiated by the February 1, 2021 coup;

Whereas senior generals of the Burmese military have been sanctioned by the United States Government for serious human rights abuses and for their role in the coup and are subject to ongoing investigations into their conduct by the International Criminal Court and the International Court of Justice;

Whereas, on January 28, 2021, the Union Election Commission rejected allegations by the Burmese military that fraud played a significant role in determining the outcome of the November 2020 elections;

Whereas Burma's November 2020 elections resulted in the National League for Democracy party securing enough seats in Parliament to form the next government;

Whereas Burmese military general Min Aung Hlaing has announced his intentions for Burmese parliamentary elections to be held by August 1, 2023;

Whereas, without full participation from relevant political forces in the country, including civil society groups and opposition parties, and without a robust presence of credible international observers, the results of any parliamentary election run by the military regime will not gain widespread acceptance, domestically or internationally;

Whereas, in July 2022, the Burmese military executed four male activists accused of aiding insurgents to fight Burma's army following secret trials;

Whereas, in response to the Civil Disobedience Movement's opposition protests, the Burmese military has used live fire, water cannons, and rubber bullets against peace protesters;

Whereas, in December 2021, violent reprisals against peaceful protests resulted in the

torture and subsequent deaths of over 40 civilians in Sagaing;

Whereas the Burmese military has a long history of committing atrocities against the people of Burma, including the targeting of specific ethnic groups;

Whereas, as of October 2022, over 943,000 stateless Rohingya refugees reside in Ukhiya and Teknaf Upazilas, Bangladesh, the vast majority of whom live in 34 extremely congested camps;

Whereas, on March 21, 2022, the United States Secretary of State formally determined that members of the Burmese military committed genocide and crimes against humanity against Rohingya in 2016 and 2017;

Whereas the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and ASEAN member states continue to play an important role in addressing the crisis in Burma, including through the provision of humanitarian assistance in Burma and by preventing junta leadership from participating in ASEAN meetings, absent progress on the 5 Point Consensus;

Whereas United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in Myanmar Thomas H. Andrews and Special Envoy of the Secretary-General on Myanmar Noeleen Heyzer continue to provide ongoing reporting and analysis of the dire and deteriorating situation for the men, women, and children of Burma, inside the country and as refugees, including through presentations to the United Nations Human Rights Council and the United Nations General Assembly, and through reports that document the illegitimacy of the Burmese junta and urge member states to engage in coordinated sanctions and weapon embargos against the junta;

Whereas the Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar continues to collect, consolidate, preserve, and analyze evidence of serious international crimes and violations of international law committed in Myanmar since 2011, and helps to facilitate and expedite fair and independent criminal proceedings; and

Whereas, in December 2022, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 2669 on Burma, the first resolution on Burma since the country was admitted as a member state in 1948, calling for the immediate end to all forms of violence and urging restraint and the release of all prisoners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the people of Burma in their quest for democracy, sustainable peace, and genuine ethnic and religious reconciliation, and the realization of internationally recognized human rights for all, including for ethnic and religious groups whose human rights have been violated repeatedly and who have been disenfranchised historically;

(2) calls on the Burmese military to—

(A) immediately and unconditionally release all political prisoners detained as a result of the coup on February 1, 2021;

(B) immediately restore all forms of communication, including access to the internet without surveillance;

(C) immediately end the use of violence and allow for a legal process for accountability and justice for those unlawfully detained, injured, and killed by the Burmese military;

(D) remove all impediments to free travel that have been imposed as a result of the coup;

(E) return to power all members of the civilian government elected in the November 8, 2020 elections and allow them to fulfill their mandate without impediment;

(F) allow for freedom of expression, including the right to protest, peaceful assembly,

press freedom, and freedom of movement; and

(G) allow unfettered reporting from local, national, and international media;

(3) calls on social media companies to suspend the accounts of the Union Solidarity and Development Party and the Burmese military that have used their platforms to spread disinformation, fear, and threats of violence;

(4) supports the use of all diplomatic, economic, and development tools to ensure that vulnerable groups, including ethnic and religious groups, as well as all children, youth, and teachers in educational settings are safe, and schools and universities are not targeted for attacks or use by the Burmese military;

(5) expresses grave concern for the safety and security of the more than 1,000,000 internally displaced persons (referred to in this resolution as “IDPs”) and refugees who have been displaced by the Burmese military and now face challenging conditions in camps;

(6) expresses grave concern for the 17,600,000 people of Burma who are in need of humanitarian aid, including the 1,500,000 IDPs in Burma, of which some 165,000 remain in the southeast, adding to those already displaced in Rakhine, Chin, Shan, and Kachin states;

(7) appreciates the generosity of Burma’s neighboring countries, including Thailand, India, and Bangladesh, and encourages them to meaningfully assist refugees who have fled and continue to flee the Burmese military, including through the delivery of cross-border humanitarian assistance and with recognition of the protracted nature of the conflict; and

(8) calls on the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense to fully implement section 7008 of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2021 (division K of Public Law 116-260), the BURMA Act of 2022 (subtitle E of title LV of division E of Public Law 117-263), and any similar or successor law governing United States foreign assistance following a coup, and to immediately—

(A) impose targeted restrictions aimed at the Burmese military, military-owned or -controlled enterprises, and those responsible for the February 1, 2021 coup;

(B) work with the international community, including at the United Nations Security Council, with United States’ allies in the region, and with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, to condemn the coup, delegitimize the junta and any military-run elections announced by the junta, and take steps to ensure that international economic engagement in Burma does not contribute to human rights abuses or benefit individuals connected to the coup;

(C) support conditionality on diplomatic, economic, and security relations with Burma, including using the voice and vote of the United States at multilateral development institutions, until all those detained in the February 1, 2021 coup are released and there has been a full restoration of the civilian-controlled parliament reflecting the November 8, 2020 election results;

(D) utilize the United States Government’s position on the United Nations Security Council to bring about greater international cooperation in the pursuit of justice and accountability in Burma;

(E) empower and provide assistance to the National Unity Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar, the National Unity Consultative Council, the Civil Disobedience Movement in Myanmar, and other entities promoting democracy in Burma through nonviolent efforts, including channeling aid through local civil society organizations along the Thai and Indian borders that are not controlled by the junta, while

simultaneously denying legitimacy and resources to the junta;

(F) promote national reconciliation among the diverse ethnic and religious groups in Burma;

(G) counter support to the junta by the People’s Republic of China and the Russian Federation and other supporters of the military regime; and

(H) secure the restoration of democracy, the establishment of an inclusive and representative civilian government and a reformed military reflecting the diversity of Burma and under civilian control, and the enactment of constitutional, political, and economic reform in Burma.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today, on the eve of the second anniversary of the military coup in Burma, to introduce a resolution marking the occasion—and the terrible 2 years that the people of Burma have had to suffer since then. I am proud to introduce this resolution today alongside my colleagues Senators YOUNG, MERKLEY, and COLLINS.

The resolution condemns the illegitimate Burmese military coup and calls for an immediate return to democratic governance grounded in respect for civil liberties. Demonstrating our support for the Burmese people is more important than ever, as the human rights situation in Burma threatens to deteriorate even further.

Tomorrow marks 2 years since the Burmese military overthrew the democratically elected Government in Burma, on the eve of what was to have been the convening of the Parliament that was elected on November 8, 2020, and installed a repressive, authoritarian regime.

Since February 1, 2021, the Burmese military has reversed years of uneven but generally positive democratic reform. The military has engaged in mass atrocities, including by detaining over 13,000 people for exercising basic freedoms and killing over 2,800 civilians, including children. Today, over 17 million people in Burma are in need of humanitarian aid, and 1.5 million people remain internally displaced due to the ongoing violence and instability fostered by the military.

I would note that it is the same military officers now running the country who were implicated in the genocide waged against the Rohingya people, an assault that was recognized by the Secretary of State on March 21, 2022, only the eighth such determination since the Holocaust. The Burmese military continues to systemically target its most vulnerable people, including women, children, and ethnic and religious minorities. The junta also continues to silence activists and opposition parties, most recently illustrated by the 33-year prison sentence handed down to State Counsellor Aung San Suu Kyi after a series of sham trials.

Today, we honor those lives we have lost due to the junta’s violent repression and calls upon the Burmese military to end its senseless killing of its own people.

The U.S. Senate fully stands behind those peacefully protesting for their

rights to freedom of speech, assembly, and the press. We also remain committed to free and fair elections in Burma and the peaceful and expedient transition to a civilian-led government. The United States and the international community must hold accountable human rights violators for their actions. This resolution calls on the President to impose targeted sanctions and restrictions on those responsible for the February 2021 coup and human rights abuses in Burma, including through the bipartisan BURMA Act of 2022, which I was proud to have led, and which was enacted as part of the NDAA in December.

While the February 2021 coup represents a major step backwards, the United States remains steadfast in support of a free and prosperous future for Burma. This resolution, which I am proud to introduce today, will reaffirm the United States' solidarity with the Burmese people in their quest for sustainable peace and democracy.

I would invite my colleagues to co-sponsor the resolution, and I look forward to early action in the Foreign Relations Committee and by the full Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I have one request for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 31, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed roundtable.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2023

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, February 1; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly Democratic caucus meeting.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, rollcall votes are expected during Wednesday's session.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:52 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, February 1, 2023, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

AMANDA K. BRAILSFORD, OF IDAHO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO, VICE B. LYNN WINMILL, RETIRED.

JEFFREY IRVINE CUMMINGS, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE AN ADDITIONAL POSITION IN ACCORDANCE WITH 28 U.S.C. 133(B)(1).

MICHAEL ARTHUR DELANEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT, VICE JEFFREY R. HOWARD, RETIRED.

LASHONDA A. HUNT, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE CHARLES R. NORGLER, SR., RETIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. SEAN M. CARPENTER
COL. MARY K. HADDAD
COL. JAMES L. HARTLE
COL. AARON J. HEICK
COL. JOSEPH D. JANIK
COL. MICHAEL T. MCGINLEY
COL. KEVIN J. MERRILL
COL. TARA E. NOLAN
COL. RODERICK C. OWENS
COL. MARK D. RICHEY
COL. NORMAN B. SHAW, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. KRISTIN A. HILLERY
COL. MICHELLE L. WAGNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ELIZABETH E. ARLEDGE
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT M. BLAKE
BRIG. GEN. VANESSA J. DORNHOEFER
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER A. FREEMAN
BRIG. GEN. DAVID P. GARFIELD
BRIG. GEN. MITCHELL A. HANSON
BRIG. GEN. JODY A. MERRITT
BRIG. GEN. ADRIAN K. WHITE
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM W. WHITTENBERGER, JR.
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER F. YANCY